arXiv:0808.2709v2 [math.DS] 30 Aug 2008

Invariant Manifolds for Analytic Dynamical Systems over Ultrametric Fields

Helge Glöckner

Abstract

We give an exposition of the theory of invariant manifolds around a fixed point, in the case of time-discrete, analytic dynamical systems over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$. Typically, we consider an analytic manifold M modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over $\mathbb{K}$, an analytic diffeomorphism $f\colon M \to M$, and a fixed point p of f. Under suitable assumptions on the tangent map $T_p(f)$, we construct a centre-stable manifold, a centre manifold, respectively, an a-stable manifold around p, for a given real number $a \in \,]0, 1]$.

Classification: 37D10 (Primary) 46S10, 26E30 (Secondary)

Key words: Dynamical system, fixed point, invariant manifold, stable manifold, centre manifold, ultrametric field, local field, non-archimedean analysis, analytic map, Lie group, contractive automorphism, contraction group

Contents

1. Introduction and statement of the main results 2
2. Preliminaries and notation 10
3. Centre-stable manifolds 15
4. Centre manifolds 21
5. Mappings between sequence spaces 24
6. Construction of local stable manifolds 27
7. Global stable manifolds 36
8. Local unstable manifolds 37
9. Spectral interpretation of hyperbolicity 38
10. Behaviour close to a fixed point 42
11. When $W_a^{\mathrm{s}}(f,p)$ is not only immersed 45
12. Further conclusions in the finite-dimensional case 46
13. Specific results concerning automorphisms of Lie groups 47

Appendix A: Proof of Proposition 4.2 51
Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 8.3 54

1 Introduction and statement of main results

In this article, we construct various types of invariant manifolds for analytic dynamical systems over complete ultrametric fields. The invariant manifolds are useful in the theory of Lie groups over local fields, where they allow results to be extended to ground fields of positive characteristic, which previously where available only in characteristic 0 (i.e., for p-adic Lie groups). The results also constitute a first step towards a theory of partially hyperbolic dynamical systems over complete ultrametric fields.

Definitions and main results. As in the real case, hyperbolicity assumptions are essential for a discussion of invariant manifolds. To explain the appropriate conditions in the ultrametric case, let E be an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$. Let $\alpha\colon E \to E$ be a continuous $\mathbb{K}$-linear map, and $a \in\,]0, \infty[$.

Definition 1.1 We say that α is *a-hyperbolic* if there exist α-invariant vector subspaces $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ of E such that $E = E_{a,\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$, and an ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E defining its topology, with properties (a)–(c):

(a) $\|x + y\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$ for all $x \in E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ and $y \in E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$;

(b) $\alpha_2 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{u}}}$ is invertible;

(c) $\|\alpha_1\| < a$ and $\frac{1}{\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|} > a$ holds for the operator norms with respect to $\|.\|$, where $\alpha_1 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{s}}}$ (and $\frac{1}{0} := \infty$).

Then $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ is uniquely determined (see Remark 6.6). If $a = 1$, we also write $E_\mathrm{s} := E_{1,\mathrm{s}}$ and $E_\mathrm{u} := E_{1,\mathrm{u}}$.

As is to be expected, a-hyperbolicity can be read off from the spectrum of α if E is finite-dimensional (see Corollary 9.7): Then α is a-hyperbolic if and only if $a \neq |\lambda|$ for each eigenvalue λ of $\alpha \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$.

Now consider an analytic manifold M modelled on an ultrametric Banach space E over $\mathbb{K}$ (as in [10]). Let $f\colon M \to M$ be an analytic diffeomorphism, and $p \in M$ be a fixed point of f.

Definition 1.2 Given $a \in\,]0, 1]$, we define $W_a^\mathrm{s}(f, p) \subseteq M$, the *$a$-stable set* around p with respect to f, as the set of all $x \in M$ such that

$$f^n(x) \to p \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty \quad \text{and} \quad a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| \to 0\,, \tag{1}$$

for some (and hence every) chart $\kappa\colon U \to V \subseteq E$ of M around p such that $\kappa(p) = 0$, and some (and hence every) ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E defining its topology.[1]

It is clear from the definition that $W_a^{\rm s} := W_a^{\rm s}(f,p)$ is stable under f, i.e., $f(W_a^{\rm s}) = W_a^{\rm s}$. Now a-hyperbolicity of $T_p(f)$ ensures that $W_a^{\rm s}$ is a manifold, the *a-stable manifold* around p with respect to f (see Section 7):

Theorem 1.3 (Ultrametric Stable Manifold Theorem) *Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$. Let $f\colon M \to M$ be an analytic diffeomorphism and $p \in M$ be a fixed point of f. If $a \in \,]0,1]$ and $T_p(f)\colon T_p(M) \to T_p(M)$ is a-hyperbolic, then there exists a unique analytic manifold structure on $W_a^{\rm s} := W_a^{\rm s}(f,p)$ such that* (a)–(c) *hold:*

(a) *$W_a^{\rm s}$ is an immersed submanifold of M;*

(b) *$W_a^{\rm s}$ is tangent to the a-stable subspace $T_p(M)_{a,{\rm s}}$ (with respect to $T_p(f)$), i.e., $T_p(W_a^{\rm s}) = T_p(M)_{a,{\rm s}}$;*

(c) *f restricts to an analytic diffeomorphism $W_a^{\rm s} \to W_a^{\rm s}$.*

Moreover, each neighbourhood of p in $W_a^{\rm s}$ contains an open neighbourhood Ω of p in $W_a^{\rm s}$ which is a submanifold of M, is f-invariant (i.e., $f(\Omega) \subseteq \Omega$), and such that $W_a^{\rm s} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{-n}(\Omega)$.

In case of 1-hyperbolicity, one simply speaks of hyperbolicity. Moreover, $W_1^{\rm s}$ is simply called the *stable manifold* around p, and denoted $W^{\rm s}$.

To obtain so-called *centre-stable manifolds* and *centre manifolds* around a given fixed point p, again we need to impose appropriate conditions on $T_p(f)$. To formulate these, let E be an ultrametric Banach space over $\mathbb{K}$. Moreover, let $\alpha\colon E \to E$ be a continuous linear map, and $a \in \,]0,\infty[$.

Definition 1.4 An α-invariant vector subspace $E_{a,{\rm cs}} \subseteq E$ is called an *a-centre-stable subspace* with respect to α if there exists an α-invariant vector subspace $E_{a,{\rm u}}$ of E such that $E = E_{a,{\rm cs}} \oplus E_{a,{\rm u}}$ and $\alpha_2 := \alpha|_{E_{a,{\rm u}}}\colon E_{a,{\rm u}} \to E_{a,{\rm u}}$ is invertible, and there exists an ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E defining its topology, with the following properties:

---

[1] See Remark 6.7 for the independence of the choice of κ and $\|.\|$.

(a) $\|x+y\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$ for all $x \in E_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$, $y \in E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$; and

(b) $\|\alpha_1\| \leq a$ and $\frac{1}{\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|} > a$ holds for the operator norms with respect to $\|.\|$, where $\alpha_1 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{cs}}}$.

Then $E_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$ is uniquely determined (see Remark 3.3).

Definition 1.5 If α is an automorphism, we say that an α-invariant vector subspace $E_{a,\mathrm{c}} \subseteq E$ is an *a-centre subspace* with respect to α if there exist α-invariant vector subspaces $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ of E such that $E = E_{a,\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{a,\mathrm{c}} \oplus E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$, and an ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E defining its topology, with the following properties:

(a) $\|x+y+z\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|, \|z\|\}$ for all $x \in E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$, $y \in E_{a,\mathrm{c}}$ and $z \in E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$;

(b) $\|\alpha(x)\| = a\|x\|$ for all $x \in E_{a,\mathrm{c}}$; and

(c) $\|\alpha_1\| < a$ and $\frac{1}{\|\alpha_3^{-1}\|} > a$ hold for the operator norms with respect to $\|.\|$, where $\alpha_1 := \alpha|_{E_{a,s}}$ and $\alpha_3 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{u}}}$.

Then $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$, $E_{a,\mathrm{c}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ are uniquely determined (Remark 4.3); $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ are called the *a-stable* and *a-unstable* subspaces of E with respect to α, respectively (and likewise in Definition 1.1). If $a = 1$, we simply speak of stable, centre and unstable subspaces, and write E_{s}, E_{c} and E_{u} instead of $E_{1,\mathrm{s}}$, $E_{1,\mathrm{c}}$ and $E_{1,\mathrm{u}}$.

If E is finite-dimensional, then an a-centre-stable subspace with respect to a linear map $\alpha\colon E \to E$ always exists, for any $a \in \,]0, \infty[$. An a-centre subspace exists if E is finite-dimensional and α an automorphism (see Section 9).

1.6 Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$. Let $M_0 \subseteq M$ be open, $f\colon M_0 \to M$ be an analytic mapping, $p \in M_0$ be a fixed point of f, and $a \in \,]0, 1]$.

Definition 1.7 If $T_p(M)$ has an a-centre-stable subspace $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, we call an immersed submanifold $N \subseteq M_0$ an *a-centre-stable manifold* around p with respect to f if (a)–(d) are satisfied:

(a) $p \in N$;

(b) N is tangent to $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$ at p, i.e., $T_p(N) = T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$;

(c) $f(N) \subseteq N$; and

(d) $f|_N \colon N \to N$ is analytic.

If $a = 1$, we simply speak of a *centre-stable manifold*.

Definition 1.8 If $T_p(f)$ is an automorphism and $T_p(M)$ has a centre subspace $T_p(M)_{\mathrm{c}}$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, we say that an immersed submanifold $N \subseteq M_0$ is a *centre manifold* around p with respect to f if (a), (c) and (d) fom Definition 1.7 hold as well as

(b)′ N is tangent to $T_p(M)_{\mathrm{c}}$ at p, i.e., $T_p(N) = T_p(M)_{\mathrm{c}}$.

Given a manifold M, $p \in M$ and immersed submanifolds $N_1, N_2 \subseteq M$ containing p, let us write $N_1 \sim_p N_2$ if there exists an open neighbourhood U of p in N_1 which is also an open neighbourhood of p in N_2, and on which N_1 and N_2 induce the same analytic manifold structure. The $\sim_p$-equivalence class of an immersed submanifold $N \subseteq M$ is called its *germ* at p.

The following result is obtained in Section 3:

Theorem 1.9 (Ultrametric Centre-Stable Manifold Theorem) *Let $a \in \,]0, 1]$ and assume that $T_p(M)$ admits an a-centre-stable subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, in the situation of* 1.6*. Then the following holds:*

(a) *There exists an a-centre-stable manifold N around p with respect to f;*

(b) *The germ of N at p is uniquely determined;*

(c) *Every neighbourhood of p in N contains an open neighbourhood Ω of p in N which is an a-centre-stable manifold and a submanifold of M.*

As concerns centre manifolds, we show (see Section 4):

Theorem 1.10 (Ultrametric Centre Manifold Theorem) *In the setting of* 1.6*, assume that $T_p(f)$ is an automorphism and assume that $T_p(M)$ has a centre subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$. Then*

(a) *There exists a centre manifold N around p with respect to f;*

(b) *The germ of N at p is uniquely determined;*

(c) *Each neighbourhood of p in N contains an open neighbourhood Ω of p in N which is a centre manifold, a submanifold of M, stable under f (i.e., $f(\Omega) = \Omega$), and for which $f|_{\Omega}\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ is a diffeomorphism.*

It is essential for the uniqueness assertions in part (b) of Theorem 1.9 and 1.10 that all manifolds (and submanifolds) we consider are analytic manifolds.

Local a-unstable manifolds can also be discussed, for $a \geq 1$ (see Section 8). In Sections 10 to 12, we describe general consequences of our results, and in Section 13 we draw more specific conclusions concerning Lie groups. Results from these sections are vitally used in [20] and [22], to obtain information on automorphisms of finite-dimensional Lie groups over local fields of positive characteristic. To explain the motivation for the current article, and to show the utility of its results, we now briefly describe two applications which are only available through the use of invariant manifolds.

Applications in Lie theory. If G is a totally disconnected, locally compact topological group with neutral element 1 and $\alpha\colon G \to G$ an automorphism of topological groups, then

$$U_\alpha := \{x \in G\colon \alpha^n(x) \to 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty\}$$

is called the *contraction group* of α and

$$M_\alpha := \{x \in G\colon \alpha^{\mathbb{Z}}(x) \text{ is relatively compact in } G\}$$

the *Levi factor*, where $\alpha^{\mathbb{Z}}(x) := \{\alpha^n(x)\colon n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ (see [5]). Now assume that G is an analytic finite-dimensional Lie group over a local field $\mathbb{K}$ and $\alpha\colon G \to G$ an analytic automorphism. Since $\alpha(1) = 1$, we are in the situation of the current article. Using invariant manifolds, one can prove the following results in arbitrary characteristic (the p-adic case of which is due to Wang [38])[2]:

(a) *The group U_α is always nilpotent* (see [20, Theorem B]).

(b) *If U_α is closed, then U_α, $U_{\alpha^{-1}}$ and M_α are Lie subgroups of G. Moreover, $U_\alpha M_\alpha U_{\alpha^{-1}}$ is an open subset of G and the "product map"*

$$\pi\colon U_\alpha \times M_\alpha \times U_{\alpha^{-1}} \to U_\alpha M_\alpha U_{\alpha^{-1}}\,, \quad (x, y, z) \mapsto xyz$$

is an analytic diffeomorphism (see [22]; cf. also the sketch in [21]).

---

[2] Our results also enable the calculation of the "scale" $s(\alpha)$ (introduced in [41], [42]) if U_α is closed [22], and to discuss Lie groups of type R over local fields of arbitrary characteristic. Previously, this was only possible in the p-adic case (see [15] and [33], respectively. Compare also [5] for the scale of inner automorphisms of reductive algebraic groups).

In fact, the a_j-stable manifolds $G_j := W^{\mathrm{s}}_{a_j}(\alpha, 1)$ provide a central series $\{1\} = G_1 \subseteq G_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq G_n = G$ of Lie subgroups of G, for suitable real numbers $0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_n < 1$ (see [20]). And to get (b), one heavily uses the (stable) manifold structures on $U_\alpha = W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$ and $U_{\alpha^{-1}} = W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha^{-1}, 1)$ constructed here, and the fact that M_α contains a centre manifold for α around 1 (see [22]; cf. also [21]).

Methods. Using a local chart around p, the constructions of a-centre-stable manifolds and (local) a-stable manifolds are easily reduced to the case where $M = E$ is an ultrametric Banach space and f is an analytic E-valued map on an open ball $B^E_r(0) \subseteq E$, such that $f(0) = 0$. Write $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ and (accordingly) $f = (f_1, f_2)$, where E_1 is the a-centre stable (resp., the a-stable) subspace of E and E_2 the a-unstable subspace. Now the idea is to construct an a-centre-stable manifold (resp., a local a-stable manifold) as the graph Γ of an analytic E_2-valued map ϕ on some ball in E_1.

Construction of a-centre-stable manifolds. In this case, the required f-invariance of Γ necessitates that

$$f_2(x, \phi(x)) = \phi(f_1(x, \phi(x))) \tag{2}$$

for small $x \in E_1$. Writing now f_1, f_2 and ϕ as convergent series, (2) can be read as an identity for formal series, which enables us to determine the coefficients of ϕ recursively (see Section 3).

Construction of (*local*) *a-stable manifolds.* We construct local a-stable manifolds by an adaptation of a method used by M. C. Irwin in the real case [27] . Instead of constructing the points $z = (x, \phi(x))$ of the local a-stable manifold directly, the central idea of Irwin was to construct, instead, their orbits $\omega(x) := (f^n(z))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. These are elements of a suitable Banach space of sequences, and satisfy a certain identity

$$G(\omega(x)) \;=\; \big((x,0),(0,0),\ldots\big)\,,$$

which can be solved for $\omega(x)$ using the inverse function theorem for k times continuously Fréchet differentiable functions between Banach spaces (cf. [1] for an extension of Irwin's method to real analytic dynamical systems).

As an inverse function theorem is also available for analytic maps between ultrametric Banach spaces, we can adapt Irwin's method to the ultrametric case (see Section 6 for the construction, and Section 5 for auxiliary results concerning sequence spaces). Our discussion also profited much from [40].

General remarks. It should be mentioned that (of course!) our primary interest lies in the finite-dimensional case. However, Irwin's method forces us to consider infinite-dimensional sequence spaces. Moreover, the discussion of centre-stable (and centre) manifolds actually becomes easier if one uses a coordinate-free formulation (which avoids the use of multi-indices).

We also wish to mention that although locally analytic functions are used as the basis of our studies, the dynamical systems give rise to various *global* objects (not only to germs around the fixed points). Examples are the a-stable manifold $W^s_a(f,p)$ and the Levi factor M_α in a Lie group G, which is a distinguished centre manifold (if U_α is closed).

Relations to the literature. As just explained, our methods and results have their roots in the theory of smooth dynamical systems over the real ground field, and drew some inspiration from classical sources in this area (in the case of stable manifolds).[3] Complementary to our studies, much of the literature on ultrametric dynamical systems can rather be regarded as an offspring of complex dynamics, and has concentrated on the 1-dimensional case (see, e.g., [6] and [9]). Some specific new phenomena arose there, like the existence of wandering domains [7]. It also turned out to be necessary in some situations to extend the action of polynomials or rational functions from the ordinary projective line to the Berkovich projective line, because the latter supports relevant measures while the projective line does not, in contrast to the classical complex case [14] (further ultrametric phenomena can be found in [4] and [32]. For relations to formal groups, see [30]).

While the preceding list could easily be prolonged, papers devoted to multi-dimensional non-archimedean dynamical systems are quite rare. Notable exceptions are the work of Herman and Yoccoz [25] on the analytic linearizability problem in several variables (over ultrametric fields of characteristic zero) and the closely related recent Ph.D.-thesis [37] by D. Vieugue.[4] Further works include [2] and [3]. We mention that if a (finite-dimensional) ultrametric dynamical system is analytically conjugate to a linear system (at least locally around a fixed point), then it is very easy to obtain invariant manifolds (as the images of the corresponding vector subspaces). However, an analytic linearization is only possible in special situations, and hence the existing results are insufficient to deal with the Lie-theoretic problems described above. By contrast, the results we provide are quite general, and apply just as well if a linearization is not available (and in any characteristic).

---

[3] See also [26], [24] and the references therein.

[4] Concerning the single variable case, compare also K.-O. Lindahl's thesis [29].

Perspectives. Having started on this road, it would be natural to proceed and take further steps towards a non-archimedean analogue of the theory of partially hyperbolic dynamical systems. One essential point would be the study of invariant foliations (e.g., locally around a fixed point), which would give refined information on the dynamics. Such extensions automatically lead us outside the class of analytic functions, and necessitate the consideration of functions with weaker regularity properties, like functions which are only C^k, Lipschitz, or Hölder (cf. also [24, p. 133]).[5] In fact, in the real case it is well-known that smooth (or analytic) dynamical systems may give rise to foliations which are Hölder, but not C^1 (nor Lipschitz).

From this point of view, it is very natural to construct invariant manifolds also for C^k-dynamical systems over ultrametric fields.[6] These constructions (which are more complicated than the analytic case) are in preparation. In a nutshell, Irwin's method still provides a-stable manifolds in the case of C^k-dynamical systems modelled on an ultrametric Banach space,[7] using the ultrametric inverse function theorem for C^k-maps provided in [23] (cf. [18] for weaker results). In the C^k-case, centre-stable manifolds (for finite k) are constructed as a-pseudo-stable manifolds with $a > 1$ close to 1. The latter are available through an ultrametric analogue of Irwin's method from [28] (cf. also [12]).

Let us remark in closing that part of the theory becomes nicer and easier if the real field is replaced by an ultrametric field. For example, the astute reader may have noticed that part (c) in Theorem 1.9 and 1.10 (and also Definition 1.5 (b)) would be too much to ask for in the real case. However, some other aspects become more complicated in the non-archimedean setting (for example, the discussion C^k-dynamical systems).

---

[5] See [8], [18], [19] and [23] for the basic theory of such functions. For the single-variable case, consult [34] and the references therein.

[6] These are also needed to adapt the above Lie-theoretic results to non-analytic C^k-Lie groups or non-analytic C^k-automorphisms, as constructed in [16].

[7] With some precautions if $k = 1$ and the modelling space is infinite-dimensional.

Acknowledgements. The article is an elaboration of a mini-course on ultrametric invariant manifolds given by the author at the CIRM (Luminy), as part of the *Session thématique autour de la dynamique non-archimédienne* in July 2008. The author appreciated the invitation and support. A remark by Jean-Yves Briend inspired the treatment of a-centre-stable manifolds for $a \in \,]0,1]$ (originally, the author assumed $a = 1$). Juan Rivera-Letelier gave valuable advice on the importance of weakened regularity properties, and widened the author's horizon of research perspectives. The studies were started during a research visit to the University of Newcastle (N.S.W.) in 2004, supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG, project 447 AUS-113/22/0-1) and the Australian Research Council (project LX 0349209). The manuscript was completed during a visit to Newcastle in 2008, supported by the DFG (project GL 357/6-1) and ARC (project DP0556017).

2 Preliminaries and notation

In this section, we fix notation and recall some basic (but essential) facts concerning analytic functions between open subsets of ultrametric Banach spaces. First of all, let us mention that $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ in this article. We write $\mathbb{Z}$ for the integers and $\mathbb{R}$ for the field of real numbers. If $f\colon M \to M$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $f^n := f \circ \cdots \circ f$ for the n-fold composition, and $f^0 := \mathrm{id}_M$. If f is invertible, we define $f^{-n} := (f^{-1})^n$.

Ultrametric Banach spaces. Recall that an *ultrametric field* is a field $\mathbb{K}$, together with an absolute value $|.|\colon \mathbb{K} \to [0,\infty[$ which satisfies the ultrametric inequality. We shall always assume that the metric $d\colon \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K} \to [0,\infty[$, $d(x,y) := |x - y|$, defines a non-discrete topology on $\mathbb{K}$. If the metric space $(\mathbb{K}, d)$ is complete, then the ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, d)$ is called *complete*. A totally disconnected, locally compact, non-discrete topological field is called a *local field*. Any such admits an ultrametric absolute value making it a complete ultrametric field [39]. See, e.g., [34] for background concerning complete ultrametric fields.

An *ultrametric Banach space* over an ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$ is a complete normed space $(E, \|.\|)$ over $\mathbb{K}$ whose norm $\|.\|\colon E \to [0,\infty[$ satisfies the *ultrametric inequality*, $\|x + y\| \leq \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$ for all $x, y \in E$. The ultrametric inequality entails the following *domination principle*:

$$\|x + y\| = \|x\| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in E \text{ such that } \|y\| < \|x\|. \tag{3}$$

Given $x \in E$ and $r \in \,]0,\infty]$, we set $B_r^E(x) := \{y \in E \colon \|y-x\| < r\}$.

Linear operators. Given an ultrametric Banach space E, we let $\mathcal{L}(E)$ be the set of all continuous linear self-maps of E. Then the operator norm makes $\mathcal{L}(E)$ an ultrametric Banach space, and it is a unital $\mathbb{K}$-algebra under composition. We write

$$\mathrm{GL}(E) := \mathcal{L}(E)^\times := \{A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \colon (\exists B \in \mathcal{L}(E)) \;\; AB = BA = \mathrm{id}_E\}$$

for its unit group.

2.1 The domination principle entails that $\mathrm{id}_E - A$ is an isometry for each $A \in \mathcal{L}(E)$ of operator norm $\|A\| < 1$. Moreover, $\mathrm{id}_E - A$ is invertible, because it is easy to see that the Neumann series $\sum_{k=0}^\infty A^k$ provides an inverse for $\mathrm{id}_E - A$. Then also $(\mathrm{id}_E - A)^{-1}$ is an isometry. In particular,

$$\|(\mathrm{id}_E - A)^{-1}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{L}(E) \text{ such that } \|A\| < 1. \tag{4}$$

See, e.g., [36] for background concerning ultrametric Banach spaces.

Spaces of homogeneous polynomials. We now discuss continuous homogeneous polynomials and analytic functions between ultrametric Banach spaces. As we are only dealing with a special case of the situation in [10] (our main reference), simpler notation will be sufficient.

Let $(E, \|.\|_E)$ and $(F, \|.\|_F)$ be ultrametric Banach spaces over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$. If $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we let $\mathcal{L}^k(E,F)$ be the set of all continuous k-linear mappings $\beta \colon E^k \to F$. Thus $\mathcal{L}^0(E,F) \cong F$, and $\mathcal{L}^k(E,F)$ for $k \geq 1$ is an ultrametric Banach space with norm given by

$$\|\beta\| := \sup\left\{ \frac{\|\beta(x_1,\ldots,x_k)\|_F}{\|x_1\|_E \ldots \|x_k\|_E} \colon x_1 \ldots, x_k \in E \setminus \{0\} \right\} \in [0,\infty[\,.$$

If $k \geq 1$, we write Δ_k (or Δ_k^E) for the diagonal map $E \to E^k$, $x \mapsto (x,\ldots,x)$. If $k = 0$, define $\Delta_0 := \Delta_0^E \colon E \to E^0 = \{0\}$, $x \mapsto 0$. A map $p \colon E \to F$ is called a *continuous homogeneous polynomial of degree* k if there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^k(E,F)$ such that $p = \beta \circ \Delta_k$. We let $\mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$ be the space of all continuous homogeneous polynomials $p \colon E \to F$ of degree k. Then

$$\mathcal{L}^k(E,F) \to \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)\,, \quad \beta \mapsto \beta \circ \Delta_k$$

is a surjective linear map. We equip $\mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$ with the quotient norm, which makes it an ultrametric Banach space. Thus

$$\|p\| = \inf\{\|\beta\| \colon \beta \in \mathcal{L}^k(E,F) \text{ such that } p = \beta \circ \Delta_k\}\,.$$

Pullbacks and pushforwards. If E_1, E_2 and F are ultrametric Banach spaces and $A\colon E_1 \to E_2$ is a continuous linear map, we obtain a linear map

$$\mathrm{Pol}^k(A,F)\colon\ \mathrm{Pol}^k(E_2,F) \to \mathrm{Pol}^k(E_1,F)\,,\quad p \mapsto p \circ A\,.$$

Similarly, if E, F_1 and F_2 are ultrametric Banach spaces and $B\colon F_1 \to F_2$ is a continuous linear map, we obtain a linear map

$$\mathrm{Pol}^k(E,B)\colon\ \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F_1) \to \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F_2)\,,\quad p \mapsto B \circ p\,.$$

Lemma 2.2 *The linear mappings* $A^* := \mathrm{Pol}^k(A,F)$ *and* $B_* := \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,B)$ *are continuous, of operator norm*

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^*\| &\leq \|A\|^k \qquad \textit{and} && (5)\\ \|B_*\| &\leq \|B\|\,. && (6) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $p \in \mathrm{Pol}^k(E_2,F)$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^k(E_2,F)$ such that $p = \beta \circ \Delta_k^{E_2}$, then $A^*(p) = p \circ A = \beta \circ \Delta_k^{E_2} \circ A = \gamma \circ \Delta_k^{E_1}$, where $\gamma := \beta \circ (A \times \cdots \times A)$ and $\|\gamma\| \leq \|A\|^k\|\beta\|$. Thus $\|A^*(p)\| \leq \|A\|^k\|\beta\|$ and hence $\|A^*(p)\| \leq \|A\|^k\|p\|$ (passing to the infimum), which entails (5). The proof of (6) is similar. $\square$

Analytic functions. Let E and F be ultrametric Banach spaces over a complete ultrametric field. Given $(p_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \prod_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$, let ρ be the supremum of the set of all $r \geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|p_k\| r^k \;=\; 0\,.$$

Then ρ is called the *radius of strict convergence* of the series $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_k$, and $B^E_\rho(0)$ its *domain of strict convergence.*

A function $f\colon U \to F$ on an open subset $U \subseteq E$ is called (locally) *analytic* if, for each $x \in U$, there exist $(p_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \prod_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$ such that the series $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_k$ has a positive radius ρ of strict convergence and there exists $r \in\,]0,\rho]$ such that $B^E_r(x) \subseteq U$ and

$$f(x+y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k(y) \quad \text{for all } y \in B^E_r(0).$$

We recall that if $B^E_\rho(0)$ is the domain of strict convergence of $\sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k$ with $p_k \in \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$ (and $\rho > 0$), then the corresponding function

$$f\colon B^E_\rho(0) \to F\,,\quad f(z) := \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k(z)$$

is analytic [10, 4.2.4]. It is well-known that compositions of composable analytic functions are analytic (see [10, 4.2.3 and 3.2.7]). It is important that quantitative information is available:

Let E, F and H be ultrametric Banach spaces. Assume that the series corresponding to $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \prod_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,F)$ has radius of strict convergence $\rho_1 > 0$ and the series corresponding to $(g_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \prod_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{Pol}^k(F,H)$ has radius of strict convergence $\rho_2 > 0$. Let $f\colon B^E_{\rho_1}(0) \to F$ and $g\colon B^F_{\rho_2}(0) \to H$ be the corresponding analytic functions. We assume that $f(0) \in B^F_{\rho_2}(0)$ and choose $r \in \,]0,\rho_1]$ such that

$$\sup\{\|f_k\| r^k \colon k \in \mathbb{N}\} \;\leq\; \rho_2\,.$$

Then [10, 4.1.5] ensures:

Lemma 2.3 *There exists $(h_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \prod_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{Pol}^k(E,H)$ such that $\sum_{k=0}^\infty h_k$ has radius of strict convergence at least r, and such that*

$$g(f(z)) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty h_k(z) \quad \textit{for all } z \in B^E_r(0).$$

Ultrametric inverse function theorem. The domination principle (3) implies that the inverse function theorem over ultrametric fields is much nicer than its real counterpart. To formulate the theorem, let us define

$$\mathrm{Lip}(f) := \sup\left\{\frac{\|f(y)-f(z)\|_F}{\|y-z\|_E} \colon y \neq z \in U\right\} \in [0,\infty]$$

if E and F a ultrametric Banach spaces and $f\colon U \to F$ is a function on a subset $U \subseteq E$. The function f is called (globally) *Lipschitz* if $\mathrm{Lip}(f) < \infty$. If U is open, f is analytic and $x \in U$, we write $f'(x)\colon E \to F$ for the total differential of f at x. The next fact combines [23, Thm. 5.8] and [10, 5.7.6].

Theorem 2.4 (Ultrametric Inverse Function Theorem) *Let* $(E, \|.\|)$ *be an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field,* $x \in E$*,* $r > 0$ *and* $f\colon B^E_r(x) \to E$ *be an analytic map. Let* $A \in \mathrm{GL}(E)$ *and assume that the function* $\widetilde{f}\colon B^E_r(x) \to E$ *determined by*

$$f(y) = f(x) + A.(y-x) + \widetilde{f}(y)$$

is Lipschitz, with

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) \;<\; \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}\,. \tag{7}$$

Then the following holds:

(a) $f(B^E_r(x))$ *is open,* f *is injective and* $f^{-1}\colon f(B^E_r(x)) \to E$ *is analytic.*

(b) $f(B^E_s(y)) = f(y) + A.B^E_s(0)$*, for all* $y \in B^E_r(x)$ *and* $s \in \,]0, r]$. $\square$

Remark 2.5 (a) Condition (b) in Theorem 2.4 means that f behaves on balls like an affine-linear map.

(b) $\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}$ can be interpreted as an expansion factor, in the sense that $\|Ay\| \geq \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}\|y\|$ for all $y \in E$.

(c) Condition (7) means that the remainder term $\widetilde{f}$ is dominated by the linear map A.

(d) Condition (7) is automatically satisfied if we take $A := f'(x)$ and choose $r > 0$ small enough, since the analytic map f is "strictly differentiable" at x and thus $\lim_{s\to 0} \mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}|_{B^E_s(x)}) = 0$ (see 4.2.3 and 3.2.4 in [10]).

Remark 2.6 Let $f\colon B^E_r(0) \to F$ be analytic, with $f(0) = 0$.

(a) If $\|f'(0)\| \leq a$, then Remark 2.5 (d) and (3) imply that $f(B^E_s(0)) \subseteq B^F_{as}(0)$ for all sufficiently small $s > 0$.

(b) In particular, $f(B^E_s(0)) \subseteq B^F_s(0)$ for small $s > 0$ if $\|f'(0)\| \leq 1$.

(c) If $E = F$ and $f'(0)$ is a surjective isometry, then $f(B^E_s(0)) = B^E_s(0)$ for small $s > 0$ and $f|_{B^E_s(0)}$ is an isometry, by (3), Remark 2.5 (d) and Theorem 2.4 (b).[8]

---

[8] In fact, this holds for all $s \in \,]0, r]$ such that $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}|_{B^E_s(0)}) < 1$.

Manifolds and Lie groups. An *analytic manifold* modelled on an ultrametric Banach space E over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$ is defined as usual (as a Hausdorff topological space M, together with a (maximal) set $\mathcal{A}$ of homeomorphisms ("charts") $\phi\colon U_\phi \to V_\phi$ from open subsets of M onto open subsets of E, such that $M = \bigcup_{\phi\in\mathcal{A}} U_\phi$ and the mappings $\phi\circ\psi^{-1}$ are analytic for all $\phi,\psi\in\mathcal{A}$). Also the tangent space T_pM of M at $p\in M$, analytic maps $f\colon M\to N$ between analytic manifolds, and the tangent maps $T_pf\colon T_pM\to T_{f(p)}N$ can be defined as usual (cf. [10]), as well as the tangent bundle TM and $Tf\colon TM\to TN$. If $f\colon M\to E$ is an analytic map to a Banach space, we write df for the second component of $Tf\colon TM\to TE\cong E\times E$. An *analytic Lie group* G over $\mathbb{K}$ is a group, equipped with an analytic manifold structure modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over $\mathbb{K}$, such that the group inversion and group multiplication are analytic (cf. [11]). As usual, we write $L(G) := T_1(G)$ and $L(\alpha) := T_1(\alpha)$, if $\alpha\colon G\to H$ is an analytic homomorphism between analytic Lie groups. Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space E. A subset $N\subseteq M$ is called a *submanifold* of M if there exists a complemented vector subspace F of the modelling space of M such that each point $p\in N$ is contained in the domain U of some chart $\phi\colon U\to V$ of M such that $\phi(N\cap U) = F\cap V$. By contrast, an analytic manifold N is called an *immersed submanifold* of M if $N\subseteq M$ as a set and the inclusion map $\iota\colon N\to M$ is an immersion. Subgroups of Lie groups with analogous properties are called *Lie subgroups* and *immersed Lie subgroups*, respectively.

3 Centre-stable manifolds

In this section, we prove the Ultrametric Centre-Stable Manifold Theorem (Theorem 1.9), and discuss related topics. We first regard the local situation.

Let $(E,\|.\|)$ be an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K},|.|)$, such that $E=E_1\oplus E_2$ as a topological vector space with closed vector subspaces E_1 and E_2, such that

$$\|x+y\| = \max\{\|x\|,\|y\|\} \quad \text{for all } x\in E_1 \text{ and } y\in E_2. \tag{8}$$

Given $r>0$, we have $B^E_r(0) = B^{E_1}_r(0)\times B^{E_2}_r(0)$, by (8). Let $f=(f_1,f_2)\colon B^E_r(0)\to E = E_1\oplus E_2$ be an analytic map such that $f(0)=0$ and $f'(0)$

leaves E_1 and E_2 invariant. Thus

$$f'(0) = A \oplus B$$

with certain continuous linear maps $A\colon E_1 \to E_1$ and $B\colon E_2 \to E_2$. Let $a \in \,]0,1]$. We assume that

$$\|A\| \leq a \tag{9}$$

and we assume that there exists a right inverse $C \in \mathcal{L}(E_2)$ to B (i.e., $B \circ C = \mathrm{id}_{E_2}$) such that[9]

$$\frac{1}{\|C\|} > a\,. \tag{10}$$

Then

$$f(x,y) = (Ax, By) + \widetilde{f}(x,y)$$

determines an analytic map $\widetilde{f} = (\widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2)\colon B_r^E(0) \to E$ such that $\widetilde{f}(0) = 0$ and $\widetilde{f}\,'(0) = 0$. After shrinking r, we may assume that $\widetilde{f}$ is Lipschitz with

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) < a \tag{11}$$

(see Remark 2.5 (d)), and that

$$\widetilde{f}_1(x,y) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k(x,y) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{f}_2(x,y) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_k(x,y)$$

for all $x \in B_r^{E_1}(0)$ and $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$, for suitable continuous homogeneous polynomials $a_k\colon E \to E_1$ and $b_k\colon E \to E_2$ of degree k such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|a_k\| r^k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \|b_k\| r^k = 0\,.$$

After replacing $f(x)$ by $\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda x)$ with $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ sufficiently small, we can achieve that

$$\|a_k\|, \|b_k\| < 1 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 2.$$

After decreasing r, we may assume that

$$r \leq 1\,. \tag{12}$$

Then the following holds:

---

[9] We are only interested in the case where B is invertible, but this hypothesis is not needed for the following construction.

Proposition 3.1 *There exists an analytic function* $\phi\colon B^{E_1}_{ar}(0) \to E_2$ *with the following properties:*

(a) $\phi(B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)) \subseteq B^{E_2}_{ar}(0)$ *and the graph of* ϕ *is* f*-invariant, more precisely*

$$f(\Gamma_s) \subseteq \Gamma_{as} \subseteq \Gamma_s \quad \textit{for all } s \in \,]0, ar], \tag{13}$$

where $\Gamma_s := \{(x, \phi(x))\colon x \in B^{E_1}_s(0)\}$ *for* $s \in \,]0, ar]$*;*

(b) $\phi(0) = 0$ *and* $\phi'(0) = 0$ *(whence* $T_{(0,0)}(\Gamma_{ar}) = E_1$*); and*

(c) *There are continuous homogeneous polynomials* $c_k\colon E_1 \to E_2$ *of degree* k *with* $\|c_k\| < a^{1-k}$ *and* $\phi(x) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k(x)$ *for all* $x \in B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)$*.*

If B *is invertible, then* ϕ *is uniquely determined.*

Proof. For all integers $k \geq 2$, we choose $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, E_1)$ and $\beta_k \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, E_2)$ such that $a_k = \alpha_k \circ \Delta^E_k$, $b_k = \beta_k \circ \Delta^E_k$, and $\|\alpha_k\|$, $\|\beta_k\| < 1$.

If ϕ is an analytic function of the form described in (c), then

$$\sup\{\|c_k\|(ar)^k\colon k \geq 2\} \;\leq\; r$$

(using (12)) and $\phi(0) = 0$. Hence $f(x, \phi(x))$ is defined for all $x \in B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)$ and given globally by its Taylor series around 0 (by Lemma 2.3). Now let $x \in B^{E_1}_s(0)$, where $s \in \,]0, ar]$. Then

$$\|\phi(x)\| \;\leq\; \|x\|\,,$$

since $\|c_k(x)\| \;\leq\; \|c_k\| \cdot \|x\|^k \;\leq\; a^{1-k}\|x\|^k \;=\; \big(\frac{\|x\|}{a}\big)^{k-1}\|x\| \;\leq\; \|x\|$. Hence $\phi(B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)) \;\subseteq\; B^{E_2}_{ar}(0)$. Moreover, $\|f_1(x, \phi(x))\| \;=\; \|Ax + \widetilde{f}_1(x, \phi(x))\| \;\leq\; a\|x\| < as \leq s$ (using (11)), and hence

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, \phi(x)) \in \Gamma_s \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad f(x, \phi(x)) = \big(f_1(x, \phi(x)),\, \phi(f_1(x, \phi(x)))\big) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad f_2(x, \phi(x)) = \phi(f_1(x, \phi(x)))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We mention that also the right hand side of (14) is given on all of $B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)$ by its Taylor series around 0, because the homogeneous polynomials η_j of the Taylor series of $f_1 \circ (\mathrm{id}, \phi)$ around 0 vanish if $j = 0$ and have norm $\|\eta_j\| \;\leq\; a^{2-j}$ if $j \geq 1$ (as will be verified in (22)), whence $\|\eta_j\|(ar)^j \;\leq\; ar$

and so Lemma 2.3 applies. Hence the validity of (14) for all $x \in B^{E_1}_{ar}(0)$ is equivalent to an identity of formal series:

$$\begin{aligned} & B(c_2(x)+c_3(x)+\cdots)+b_2(x,c_2(x)+\cdots)+b_3(x,c_2(x)+\cdots)+\cdots \\ = \quad & c_2\big(Ax+a_2(x,c_2(x)+c_3(x)+\cdots)+a_3(x,c_2(x)+\cdots)+\cdots\big) \\ + \quad & c_3\big(Ax+a_2(x,c_2(x)+c_3(x)+\cdots)+a_3(x,c_2(x)+\cdots)+\cdots\big) \\ + \quad & \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Comparing the lowest order term (of second order) on both sides, we see that

$$Bc_2(x)+b_2(x,0)=c_2(Ax)$$

is required, which can be rewritten as $(B_*-A^*)(c_2)=-b_2(\bullet,0)$ or

$$B_*(\mathrm{id}-C_*A^*)(c_2)=-b_2(\bullet,0)\,, \tag{16}$$

writing $A^*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(A,E_2)$, $B_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(E_1,B)$ and $C_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(E_1,C)$ as in Lemma 2.2. Since $\|C_*A^*\|\leq\|C\|\cdot\|A\|^2\leq\|C\|\cdot\|A\|<1$ by Lemma 2.2, using 2.1 it follows that $\mathrm{id}-C_*A^*$ is invertible and $\|(\mathrm{id}-C_*A^*)^{-1}\|\leq 1$. Thus

$$c_2:=(\mathrm{id}-C_*A^*)^{-1}C_*(-b_2(\bullet,0))\in\mathrm{Pol}^2(E_1,E_2)$$

has norm $\|c_2\|\leq\|C_*\|\cdot\|b_2(\bullet,0)\|\leq\|C\|<\frac{1}{a}$. Moreover, (16) holds for this choice of c_2, and if B is invertible, then c_2 is determined by (16).

Let $n\geq 3$ now and, by induction, suppose that we have already found $c_k\in\mathrm{Pol}^k(E_1,E_2)$ for $k=2,\ldots,n-1$ such that $\|c_k\|<a^{1-k}$ and (15) holds up to order $n-1$ if these $c_2,\ldots,c_{n-1}$ are used (and that these are unique if B is invertible). For $k=2,\ldots,n-1$, let $\gamma_k\in\mathcal{L}^k(E_1,E_2)$ such that $c_k=\gamma_k\circ\Delta^{E_1}_k$ and $\|\gamma_k\|<a^{1-k}$. Define $\gamma_1(x):=x$ for $x\in E_1$. Identifying E_1 with the vector subspace $E_1\times\{0\}$ of E and E_2 with $\{0\}\times E_2$, the previous maps take x to $(0,\gamma_k(x))$ and $(x,0)$, respectively.

Define $A^*:=\mathrm{Pol}^n(A,E_2)$, $B_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^n(E_1,B)$ and $C_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^n(E_1,C)$. The n-th order term of (15) then reads

$$B_*(c_n)+r_n=A^*(c_n)+s_n \tag{17}$$

with

$$r_n=\sum_{k=2}^{n}\sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}}\beta_k\circ(\gamma_{j_1},\ldots,\gamma_{j_k}) \tag{18}$$

and

$$s_n = \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}} \gamma_k \circ (\eta_{j_1},\ldots,\eta_{j_k})\,, \tag{19}$$

where $\eta_1 := A$ and

$$\eta_j = \sum_{\ell=2}^{j} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\ldots,i_\ell\in\mathbb{N}\\ i_1+\cdots+i_\ell=j}} \alpha_\ell \circ (\gamma_{i_1},\ldots,\gamma_{i_\ell}) \tag{20}$$

for $j = 2,\ldots,n-1$. For $j_1,\ldots,j_k$ as in (18), we have

$$\|\beta_k \circ (\gamma_{j_1} \times \cdots \times \gamma_{j_k})\| \le \|\beta_k\| \cdot a^{1-j_1} \cdots a^{1-j_k} < a^{k-n} \le a^{2-n}\,.$$

Since $\beta_k \circ (\gamma_{j_1},\ldots,\gamma_{j_k}) = \beta_k \circ (\gamma_{j_1} \times \cdots \times \gamma_{j_k}) \circ \Delta_n^{E_1}$, we conclude that

$$\|r_n\| \;<\; a^{2-n}\,. \tag{21}$$

Likewise, the norm of each summand in (20) is $< a^{\ell-j} \le a^{2-j}$, and thus

$$\|\eta_j\| \;<\; a^{2-j}\,. \tag{22}$$

Consequently, the norm of each summand in (19) is at most $\|\gamma_k\| \cdot a^{2k-n} < a^{1-k}a^{2k-n} = a^{k-n+1} \le a^{2-n}$. Therefore,

$$\|s_n\| \;<\; a^{2-n}\,. \tag{23}$$

In view of Lemma 2.2, (4), (21) and (23),

$$c_n := (\mathrm{id} - C_*A^*)^{-1} C_*(s_n - r_n) \in \mathrm{Pol}^n(E_1, E_2)$$

is a solution to

$$(B_* - A^*)(c_n) = B_*(\mathrm{id} - C_*A^*)(c_n) = s_n - r_n$$

(an hence to (17)), of norm $\|c_n\| \le \|C\| \cdot a^{2-n} < a^{1-n}$. If B is invertible, then $B_* - A^* = B_*(\mathrm{id} - (B^{-1})_*A^*)$ is invertible, entailing that c_n is uniquely determined by (17). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.9.

3.2 Let $E := T_p(M)$ and $\kappa\colon P \to U \subseteq E$ be a chart of M_0 around p such that $\kappa(p) = 0$ and $d\kappa(0) = \mathrm{id}_E$. Let $Q \subseteq P$ be an open neighbourhood of p such that $f(Q) \subseteq P$; after shrinking Q, we may assume that $\kappa(Q) = B^E_r(0)$ for some $r > 0$. Then $g := \kappa \circ f|_Q \circ \kappa^{-1}|_{B^E_r(0)}\colon B^E_r(0) \to E$ expresses $f|_Q$ in the local chart κ.

(a) Let $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$, with the norm $\|.\|$, be the decomposition of E into an a-centre-stable subspace E_1 and an a-unstable subspace E_2 with respect to $\alpha := T_p(f) = g'(0)$ (as in Definition 1.4). Applying Proposition 3.1 to g (instead of f), we see that, possibly after shrinking r, there is an analytic map $\phi\colon B^{E_1}_{ar}(0) \to B^{E_2}_{ar}(0)$ as described there. Then the graph Γ_{ar} of ϕ is a submanifold of $B^E_r(0)$ tangent to E_1 at 0, and hence $N := \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_{ar})$ is a submanifold of Q (and hence of M_0) tangent to $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$ at p. Now $g(\Gamma_{ar}) \subseteq \Gamma_{ar}$, where Γ_{ar} is a submanifold and g is analytic. Hence g restricts to an analytic map $\Gamma_{ar} \to \Gamma_{ar}$. Thus f restricts to an analytic map $N \to N$.

(c) Let $\mu\colon V \to B^{E_1}_\tau(0)$ be a chart of N around p such that $\mu(p) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_1}$. There exists $\sigma \in\,]0, \tau]$ such that $h := \mu \circ f \circ \mu^{-1}$ is defined on all of $B^{E_1}_\sigma(0)$. Since $h'(0) = T_p(f|_N) =: A$ with $\|A\| \leq a$, Remark 2.6 (a) shows that $h(B^{E_1}_s(0)) \subseteq B^{E_1}_{as}(0) \subseteq B^{E_1}_s(0)$ for all $s \in\,]0, \sigma]$, after possibly shrinking σ. Moreover, we may assume that $\Omega_s := \mu^{-1}(B^{E_1}_s(0))$ is a submanifold of M for each $s \in\,]0, \sigma]$ (after shrinking σ further if necessary). Then the sets Ω_s with $s \in\,]0, \sigma]$ form a basis of open neighbourhoods of p in N, and each of them is an a-centre-stable manifold and a submanifold of M.

(b) Let N (and other notation) be as in the proof of (a) and N_1 be any a-centre-stable manifold. Write $g = (g_1, g_2) = g'(0) + \widetilde{g}\colon B^E_r(0) \to E_1 \oplus E_2$, where $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{g}) < a$ and $g'(0) = A \oplus B$ with $\|A\| \leq a$ and $\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|} > a$. Then $P \cap N_1$ is an immersed submanifold of P tangent to E_1 and hence, after replacing N_1 by an open subset of N_1 (justified by (c)), we may assume that N_1 is a submanifold of P. Since $\kappa(N_1)$ is tangent to E_1 at $0 \in E$, the inverse function theorem implies that $\kappa(N_1)$ is the graph of an analytic map $\psi\colon W \to E_2$ on some open 0-neighbourhood $W \subseteq B^{E_1}_r(0)$, with $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) = 0$ (after shrinking N_1 if necessary). By Remark 2.5 (d), we may assume that $\mathrm{Lip}(\psi) \leq 1$. Then $\mu := \mathrm{pr}_1 \circ \kappa|_{N_1}$ is a chart for N_1 such that $\mu(0) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_1}$ (where $\mathrm{pr}_1\colon E_1 \oplus E_2 \to E_1$). Hence, by the proof of (c), there exists $\sigma \in\,]0, r]$ such that $B^{E_1}_\sigma(0) \subseteq W$

$$g(\Theta_s) \;\subseteq\; \Theta_{as} \quad \text{for all } \; s \in\,]0, \sigma],$$

where $\Theta_s := \{(x, \psi(x)) \colon x \in B_s^{E_1}(0)\}$ for $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$. After shrinking σ and conjugation with a homothety if necessary, we may assume that ψ is given globally by a power series and satisfies conditions analogous to (b) and (c) in Proposition 3.1. After replacing r and σ with $\min\{r, \sigma\}$, we may assume that $r = \sigma$. Then $\phi = \psi|_{B_{ar}^{E_1}(0)}$ (by the uniqueness part of Proposition 3.1), and hence N is an open submanifold of N_1. □

Remark 3.3 We mention that $E_{s,\mathrm{cs}}$ in Definition 1.4 is uniquely determined. In fact, $E_{a,\mathrm{cs}}$ is the set of all $x \in E$ such that $a^{-n}\|\alpha^n(x)\|$ is bounded for the specified (and hence any compatible) norm. If α is invertible, then also $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ is unique, because $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ is the c-centre-stable subspace with respect to α^{-1} in this case, for each $c \in \,]\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|, \frac{1}{a}[$. Also note that $E_{a,\mathrm{cs}} = E_{b,\mathrm{cs}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}} = E_{b,\mathrm{u}}$ for all positive real numbers $b \in [\|\alpha_1\|, \frac{1}{\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|}[$.

4 Centre manifolds

In this section, we prove the Ultrametric Centre Manifold Theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Since $E := T_p(M)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, we have a decomposition $E = E_{\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{\mathrm{c}} \oplus E_{\mathrm{u}}$ and corresponding norm $\|.\|$.

(c) Let $N \subseteq M$ be a centre manifold around p with respect to f. Or, more generally (for use in the proof of (a)), let $N \subseteq M$ be an immersed submanifold containing p which is tangent to $T_p(M)_{\mathrm{c}} = E_{\mathrm{c}}$ at p, and assume that p has an open neighbourhood $P \subseteq N$ such that $f(P) \subseteq N$ and $f|_P \colon P \to N$ is analytic. Let $W \subseteq N$ be a given neighbourhood of p. We choose a chart $\mu \colon V \to B_\tau^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0)$ of N around p such that $V \subseteq W \cap P$, $\mu(p) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_{\mathrm{c}}}$. There exists $\sigma \in \,]0, \tau]$ such that $f(\mu^{-1}(B_\sigma^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0))) \subseteq V$. Then $h := \mu \circ f \circ \mu^{-1}$ defines an analytic map $B_\sigma^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0) \to E_{\mathrm{c}}$, such that $h'(0) = T_p(f)|_{E_{\mathrm{c}}}$ is a surjective linear isometry. Remark 2.6 (c) shows that $h(B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0)) = B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0)$ for all $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$ and $h|_{B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0)} \colon B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0) \to B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0)$ is an analytic diffeomorphism, after possibly shrinking σ. By the same token, we may assume that $\Omega_s := \mu^{-1}(B_s^{E_{\mathrm{c}}}(0))$ is a submanifold of M for each $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$. Then the sets Ω_s with $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$ form a basis of open neighbourhoods of p in N, and each of them is a centre manifold around p with respect to f, a submanifold of M, stable under f, and $f|_{\Omega_s} \colon \Omega_s \to \Omega_s$ is a diffeomorphism.

(a) After shrinking M and M_0, we may assume that $M_1 := f(M_0)$ is open and f an analytic diffeomorphism onto M_1. Observe that $E_{\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{\mathrm{c}}$ is a centre-stable subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, and $E_{\mathrm{c}} \oplus E_{\mathrm{u}}$ is a centre-stable subspace with respect to $T_p(f^{-1}) = T_p(f)^{-1}$. Hence Theorem 1.9 provides a centre-stable manifold N_1 around p with respect to f, and a centre-stable manifold N_2 around p with respect to $f^{-1}\colon M_1 \to M$, which are submanifolds of M. Since N_1 and N_2 are transversal at p, after shrinking N_2, we may assume that $N_1 \cap N_2$ is a submanifold of N_1 and hence of M (retaining that N_2 is a centre-stable manifold by means of Theorem 1.9 (c)). After shrinking N_2 further if necessary, we may assume that $S := f^{-1}(N_2)$ is open in N_2 and that $f^{-1}|_{N_2}\colon N_2 \to S$ is a diffeomorphism (by the inverse function theorem and Theorem 1.9 (c)). Define $P := N_1 \cap S$. Then $f(P) \subseteq N_1 \cap N_2$ and since $N := N_1 \cap N_2$ is a submanifold of M_0, the restriction of f to a map $h\colon P \to N$ is analytic. By the proof of (c), there exists an open subset $\Omega \subseteq N$ which is a centre manifold around p with respect to f.

(b) can be proved like Theorem 1.9 (b) once we know that also centre manifolds can be described as the graph of a unique power series in a given chart (the simple adaptation of the argument is left to the reader). The following proposition shows that such a description is always possible. □

We first fix the setting.

4.1 We consider an ultrametric Banach space E over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ and an automorphism $\alpha\colon E \to E$ for which there exists a centre subspace $E_2 \subseteq E$. We let E_1 be the stable subspace, E_3 be the unstable subspace and $\|.\|$ be an ultrametric norm on $E = E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3$ as described in Definition 1.5. Thus $\alpha = A \oplus B \oplus C$ in terms of automorphisms of E_1, E_2 and E_3, respectively. Let $r > 0$ and $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3)\colon B_r^E(0) \to E$ be an analytic mapping such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0) = \alpha$. Thus

$$f(x, y, z) = (Ax, By, Cz) + \widetilde{f}(x, y, z)$$

with an analytic function $\widetilde{f} = (\widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2, \widetilde{f}_3)\colon B_r^E(0) \to E$ such that $\widetilde{f}(0) = 0$ and $\widetilde{f}\,'(0) = 0$. After shrinking r, we may assume that $\widetilde{f}$ is Lipschitz with

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) < 1\,. \tag{24}$$

We may also assume that $\widetilde{f}_1(x, y, z) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k(x, y, z)$,

$$\widetilde{f}_2(x, y, z) \;=\; \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} b_k(x, y, z) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{f}_3(x, y, z) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k(x, y, z)$$

for all $x \in B_r^{E_1}(0)$, $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$ and $z \in B_r^{E_3}(0)$, for suitable continuous homogeneous polynomials $a_k \colon E \to E_1$, $b_k \colon E \to E_2$ and $c_k \colon E \to E_3$ of degree k such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|a_k\| r^k = 0\,, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \|b_k\| r^k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \|c_k\| r^k = 0\,.$$

After replacing $f(x)$ by $\lambda^{-1} f(\lambda x)$ with $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ sufficiently small, we can achieve that

$$\|a_k\|, \|b_k\|, \|c_k\| < 1 \quad \text{for all } \; k \geq 2.$$

After decreasing r, we may assume that $r \leq 1$. Then the following holds:

Proposition 4.2 *In the setting of* 4.1*, there exists a unique analytic function* $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_3) \colon B_r^{E_2}(0) \to E_1 \times E_3$ *with properties* (a)–(c)*:*

(a) $f(\Gamma_t) \subseteq \Gamma_r$ *for some* $t \in \,]0, r]$*, where* $\{(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) \colon y \in B_s^{E_2}(0)\} =: \Gamma_s$ *for* $s \in \,]0, r]$*;*

(b) $\phi(0) = 0$ *and* $\phi'(0) = 0$ (*whence* $T_0(\Gamma_r) = E_2$)*; and*

(c) *There exist continuous homogeneous polynomials* $d_k \colon E_2 \to E_1$ *and* $e_k \colon E_2 \to E_3$ *of degree* k *with* $\|d_k\|, \|e_k\| < 1$ *and* $\phi(y) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (d_k(y), e_k(y))$ *for all* $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$.

Moreover, $\phi(B_s^{E_1}(0)) \subseteq B_s^{E_1 \times E_3}(0)$ *and* $f(\Gamma_s) = \Gamma_s$*, for all* $s \in \,]0, r]$.

Because the proof of Proposition 4.2 is very similar to that of Proposition 3.1, we relegate it to an appendix (Appendix A). Note that Proposition 4.2 also provides a second (more involved) proof for the existence of centre manifolds. The above transversality argument can be re-used nicely in the C^k-case.

Remark 4.3 $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$, $E_{a,\mathrm{c}}$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ are uniquely determined in the situation of Definition 1.5 (if they exist). In fact, $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ (resp., $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$) is the set of all $x \in E$ such that $a^{-n} \|\alpha^n(x)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (resp., as $n \to -\infty$), and $E_{a,\mathrm{c}}$ is the set of all $x \in E$ such that $\{a^{-n} \|\alpha^n(x)\| \colon n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is bounded.

5 Mappings between sequence spaces

We now prove some basic facts concerning Banach spaces of sequences and non-linear mappings between them. They will be used later (in Section 6) to construct local a-stable manifolds.

For the moment, let $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ be a valued field.

Definition 5.1 If $(E, \|.\|)$ is a normed space over $\mathbb{K}$ and a a positive real number, we let $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ be the set of all sequences $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in E such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} a^{-n}\|x_n\| = 0$. Clearly $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ is a vector subspace of $E^{\mathbb{N}_0}$, and

$$\|x\|_a \;:=\; \max\{a^{-n}\|x_n\| \colon n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \quad \text{for } x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$$

is a norm on $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$. Given a subset $U \subseteq E$, we write

$$\mathcal{S}_a(U) := \{x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E) \colon (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0)\; x_n \in U\}\,.$$

Remark 5.2 The following assertions are obvious:

(a) If $|.|$ and $\|.\|$ are ultrametric, then also $\|.\|_a$ is ultrametric.

(b) If E is a Banach space, then also $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ is a Banach space.

(c) If $a \in \,]0,1]$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = 0$ for all $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$.

Our first lemma compiles various basic facts.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $(E, \|.\|_E)$ be a normed space over $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ and $a > 0$.*

(a) *The left shift $\lambda \colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, $\lambda(x) := (x_{n+1})_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ for $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, and the right shift $\rho \colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, $\rho(x) := (0, x_0, x_1, \ldots)$ are continuous linear maps, of operator norm*

$$\|\lambda\| \leq a \quad \text{and} \quad \|\rho\| \leq a^{-1}\,. \tag{25}$$

(b) *For each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the maps $\pi_m \colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to E$, $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mapsto x_m$ and $\mu_m \colon E \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, $\mu_m(x) := (0, \ldots, 0, x, 0, 0, \ldots)$ (with m zeros at the beginning) are continuous linear, of operator norm $\|\pi_m\| \leq a^m$ and $\|\mu_m\| \leq a^{-m}$.*

(c) *For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\mathcal{S}_a(E) \to E^m \times \mathcal{S}_a(E)$,*

$$(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \mapsto ((x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}), (x_{m+n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0})$$

is an isomorphism of topological vector spaces.

(d) *If $a \in]0,1]$ and $U \subseteq E$ is an open 0-neighbourhood, then $\mathcal{S}_a(U)$ is an open 0-neighbourhood in $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$.*

(e) *If also $(F, \|.\|_F)$ is a normed space over $\mathbb{K}$, equip $E \oplus F$ (which we treat as an internal direct sum) with the maximum norm, $\|x+y\| := \max\{\|x\|_E, \|y\|_F\}$ for $x \in E$, $y \in F$. Then $\mathcal{S}_a(E\oplus F) = \mathcal{S}_a(E)\oplus\mathcal{S}_a(F)$ and $\|x+y\|_a = \max\{\|x\|_a, \|y\|_a\}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ and $y \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$.*

Proof. (a) Given $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$,

$$a^{-n}\|\lambda(x)_n\| = a^{-n}\|x_{n+1}\| = a \cdot a^{-(n+1)}\|x_{n+1}\| \le a\|x\|_a$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Hence $\|\lambda(x)\|_a \le a\|x\|_a$ and thus $\|\lambda\| \le a$. The second assertion can be shown analogously.

(b) For $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, we have $\|\pi_m(x)\|_E = \|x_m\|_E = a^m a^{-m}\|x_m\|_E \le a^m\|x\|_a$. Hence $\|\pi_m\| \le a^m$. If $x \in E$, then $\|\mu_m(x)\|_a = a^{-m}\|x\|_E$ and thus $\|\mu_m\| \le a^{-m}$.

(c) Using the continuous mappings introduced in (a) and (b), the map in question can be written as $\Phi = (\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{m-1}, \lambda^m)$. It therefore is continuous linear. For $j \in \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$, let $\mathrm{pr}_j \colon E^m \times \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to E$ be the projection onto the j-th component (which we count starting with 0). Moreover, let $\mathrm{pr}_m \colon E^m \times \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ be the projection onto the final component. Then $\Psi := \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mu_j \circ \mathrm{pr}_j + \rho^m \circ \mathrm{pr}_m$ is continuous linear (by (a) and (b)), and it is easy to see that Φ and Ψ are the inverse mappings of one another.

(d) Let $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(U)$. There is $s > 0$ such that $B^E_s(0) \subseteq U$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $a^{-n}\|x_n\|_E < s$ for all $n > m$. Then $\|(x_{m+1+n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}\|_a = a^{m+1}\max\{a^{-n}\|x_n\|_E \colon n > m\} \le \max\{a^{-n}\|x_n\|_E \colon n > m\} < s$. Hence $U^{m+1} \times B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0)$ is an open neighbourhood of x, identifying $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ with $E^{m+1} \times \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ (as in (c)). Since $U^{m+1} \times B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_a(U)$ and x was arbitrary, it follows that $\mathcal{S}_a(U)$ is open.

(e) follows from the fact that the maximum of $\max\{a^{-n}\|x_n\|_E \colon n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ and $\max\{a^{-n}\|y_n\|_F \colon n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ coincides with the maximum of the numbers $a^{-n}\max\{\|x_n\|_E, \|y_n\|_F\}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. □

Various types of maps operate on sequence spaces.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $(E, \|.\|_E)$ and $(F, \|.\|_F)$ be normed spaces over $\mathbb{K}$ and $a > 0$.*

(a) *If $U \subseteq E$ is a subset such that $0 \in U$ and $f\colon U \to F$ is a Lipschitz map such that $f(0) = 0$, then $\mathcal{S}_a(f)(x) := (f(x_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ for all $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(U)$, and the map $\mathcal{S}_a(f)\colon \mathcal{S}_a(U) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ so obtained is Lipschitz, with $\operatorname{Lip}(\mathcal{S}_a(f)) \leq \operatorname{Lip}(f)$.*

(b) *If $\alpha\colon E \to F$ is continuous linear, then $\mathcal{S}_a(\alpha)(x) := (\alpha(x_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ for all $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, and the map $\mathcal{S}_a(\alpha)\colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ so obtained is continuous linear, of operator norm $\|\mathcal{S}_a(\alpha)\| \leq \|\alpha\|$.*

(c) *If $a \in \,]0, 1]$ and $p\colon E \to F$ is a continuous homogeneous polynomial of degree $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathcal{S}_a(p)(x) := (p(x_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ for all $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$, and the map $\mathcal{S}_a(p)\colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ so obtained is a continuous homogeneous polynomial of degree k, of norm $\|\mathcal{S}_a(p)\| \leq \|p\|$.*

Proof. (a) Given $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and $y = (y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathcal{S}_a(U)$, we have $a^{-n}\|f(x_n) - f(y_n)\|_F \leq a^{-n} \operatorname{Lip}(f)\|x_n - y_n\|_E$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, showing that $\mathcal{S}_a(f)(x) - \mathcal{S}_a(f)(y) \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ and $\|\mathcal{S}_a(f)(x) - \mathcal{S}_a(f)(y)\|_a \leq \operatorname{Lip}(f)\|x - y\|_a$. Taking $y = 0$, we obtain that $\mathcal{S}_a(f)(x) \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$. Thus $\mathcal{S}_a(f)$ makes sense, and it is Lipschitz of constant $\leq \operatorname{Lip}(f)$ by the preceding estimate.

(b) By (a), $\mathcal{S}_a(\alpha)$ makes sense. Since, apparently, the map $\mathcal{S}_a(\alpha)$ is linear, its Lipschitz constant (estimated in (a)) coincides with its operator norm.

(c) Let $\beta \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, F)$ such that $p = \beta \circ \Delta^E_k$. Write Δ_k for the diagonal map $\mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)^k$. Given $x^1, \ldots, x^k \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ with $x^j = (x^j_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, we define $B(x^1, \ldots, x^k) := (\beta(x^1_n, \ldots, x^k_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a^{-n}\|\beta(x^1_n, \ldots, x^k_n)\|_F &\leq a^{-n}\|\beta\| \cdot \|x^1_n\|_E \cdots \|x^k_n\|_E \\ &\leq \|\beta\|(a^{-n}\|x^1_n\|) \cdots (a^{-n}\|x^k_n\|) \qquad (26) \\ &\leq \|\beta\| \cdot \|x^1\|_a \cdots \|x^k\|_a \,. \qquad (27) \end{aligned}$$

Since the right hand side in (26) tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$, we have $B(x^1, \ldots x^k) \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$. Then B is k-linear and $B\colon \mathcal{S}_a(E)^k \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ has norm at most $\|\beta\|$, because (27) implies that $\|B(x^1, \ldots, x^k)\|_a \leq \|\beta\| \cdot \|x^1\|_a \cdots \|x^k\|_a$. Since $\mathcal{S}_a(p) = B \circ \Delta_k$, the assertion follows. □

Proposition 5.5 *Let E and F be ultrametric Banach spaces over a complete ultrametric field $\mathbb{K}$ and $f\colon U \to F$ be an analytic mapping on an open 0-neighbourhood $U \subseteq E$, such that $f(0) = 0$. Let $a \in \,]0, 1]$. Then*

$$\mathcal{S}_a(f)(x) := (f(x_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(F)$$

for all $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(U)$, *and the map*

$$\mathcal{S}_a(f)\colon \mathcal{S}_a(U) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$$

so obtained is analytic.

Proof. There are $s > 0$ and polynomials $p_k \in \operatorname{Pol}^k(E,F)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|p_k\| s^k = 0$, $B^E_s(0) \subseteq U$ and $f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty p_k(x)$ for all $x \in B^E_s(0)$. Then $\mathcal{S}_a(p_k)\colon \mathcal{S}_a(E) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ is a continuous homogeneous polynomial for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (by Lemma 5.4 (c)). Since, moreover, $\|\mathcal{S}_a(p_k)\| \leq \|p_k\|$, we see that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\mathcal{S}_a(p_k)\| s^k = 0$. Then $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \mathcal{S}_a(p_k)$ defines an analytic function $B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0) \to \mathcal{S}_a(F)$ (by [10, 4.2.4]). Since this function coincides with

$$h := \mathcal{S}_a(f)|_{B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0)}\,, \tag{28}$$

we see that $\mathcal{S}_a(f)$ is analytic on $B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0)$.

Now let $x = (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(U)$ be arbitrary. There is $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $a^{-n}\|x_n\|_E < s$ for all $n > m$. Identifying $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ with $E^{m+1} \times \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ (as in Lemma 5.3 (c)), we may consider $U^{m+1} \times B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0)$ as an open neighbourhood of x in $\mathcal{S}_a(U)$. Considered as a mapping

$$U^{m+1} \times B^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}_s(0) \to F^{m+1} \times \mathcal{S}_a(F) \cong \mathcal{S}_a(F)\,,$$

$\mathcal{S}_a(f)$ coincides with the analytic map $f \times \cdots \times f \times h$ (which involves $m+1$ factors f at the beginning, and the map h from (28)). Thus $\mathcal{S}_a(f)$ is analytic on an open neighbourhood of x and hence analytic (as x was arbitrary). □

6 Construction of local stable manifolds

We construct local stable manifolds by an adaptation of Irwin's method.

6.1 Let $(E, \|.\|)$ be an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$, such that $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ as a topological vector space with closed vector subspaces E_1 and E_2, and such that

$$\|x + y\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\} \quad \text{for all } x \in E_1,\ y \in E_2. \tag{29}$$

We interpret E also as the direct product $E_1 \times E_2$, in which case its elements are written as pairs (x, y). Given $r > 0$, we have $B^E_r(0) = B^{E_1}_r(0) \times B^{E_2}_r(0)$, by (29). Let $f = (f_1, f_2)\colon B_r^E(0) \to E = E_1 \times E_2$ be an analytic map such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(0)$ leaves E_1 and E_2 invariant. Thus

$$f'(0) = A \oplus B$$

with certain continuous linear maps $A\colon E_1 \to E_1$ and $B\colon E_2 \to E_2$. Let $a \in \,]0, 1]$. We assume that

$$\|A\| < a \tag{30}$$

and we assume that B is invertible, with

$$\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|} > a\,. \tag{31}$$

Then

$$f(x, y) = (Ax, By) + \widetilde{f}(x, y)$$

determines an analytic function $\widetilde{f} = (\widetilde{f_1}, \widetilde{f_2})\colon B_r^E(0) \to E$ such that $\widetilde{f}(0) = 0$ and $\widetilde{f}\,'(0) = 0$. By Remark 2.5 (d), after shrinking r if necessary, we may assume that $\widetilde{f}$ is Lipschitz with

$$\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) < a\,. \tag{32}$$

Then we have:

Theorem 6.2 *In the situation of* 6.1*, the set*

$$\Gamma \;:=\; \{z \in B_r^E(0)\colon f^n(z) \text{ is defined and } a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| < r \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| = 0\} \tag{33}$$

has the following properties:

(a) $f(\Gamma) \subseteq \Gamma$*, i.e.,* Γ *is* f*-invariant.*

(b) Γ *is the graph of an analytic map* $\phi\colon B_r^{E_1}(0) \to B_r^{E_2}(0)$ *with* $\phi(0) = 0$ *and* $\phi'(0) = 0$ *(and hence* $T_0\Gamma = E_1$*).*

Moreover, the following holds:

(c) ϕ *is Lipschitz, with* $\operatorname{Lip}(\phi) \leq 1$.

(d) Γ *is independent of the choice of* a *such that* $\|A\| < a < \frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}$ *and* $\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) < a$.

(e) *$\Gamma \cap B_s^E(0)$ is f-invariant for each $s \in \,]0,r]$ and has properties analogous to those of Γ described in* (33) *and* (b) *if we replace r with s there.*

(f) *For each $b > 0$ such that $\|A\| \leq b < \frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) \leq b$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &= \{z \in B_r^E(0) : f^n(z) \text{ is defined and } \|f^n(z)\| \leq b^n r \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \\ &= \{z \in B_r^E(0) : f^n(z) \text{ is defined and } \|f^n(z)\| \leq b^n \|z\| \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.\end{aligned}$$

(g) *$\|f(z)\| \leq c\|z\|$ for each $z \in \Gamma$, where $c := \max\{\|A\|, \mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f_1})\} < a$.*

(h) *If A is invertible and $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{f_1}) < \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}$, then $f(\Gamma)$ is open in Γ and $f|_\Gamma \colon \Gamma \to f(\Gamma)$ is a diffeomorphism.*

Proof. (a) is obvious from the definition of Γ.

(b) Identifying $\mathcal{S}_a(E)$ with $\mathcal{S}_a(E_1) \times \mathcal{S}_a(E_2)$ as in Lemma 5.3 (e), we can write elements $z = (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ in the form $z = (x, y)$ with $x = (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E_1)$ and $y = (y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{S}_a(E_2)$. We abbreviate $\mathcal{U} := B_r^{\mathcal{S}_a(E)}(0)$ and consider the map $g \colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{S}_a(E)$ taking $z = (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{U}$ with $z_n = (x_n, y_n)$ to the sequence $g(z)$ with n-th entry

$$g(z)_n := \begin{cases} \big(0,\, B^{-1}(y_1 - \widetilde{f_2}(z_0))\big) & \text{if } n = 0; \\ \big(f_1(z_{n-1}),\, B^{-1}(y_{n+1} - \widetilde{f_2}(z_n))\big) & \text{if } n \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $g(0) = 0$. Using the right shift ρ on $\mathcal{S}_a(E_1)$, the left shift λ on $\mathcal{S}_a(E_2)$ and the projection $\mathrm{pr}_2 \colon E = E_1 \oplus E_2 \to E_2$, we can write g as

$$g \;=\; \big(\rho \circ \mathcal{S}_a(f_1),\, \mathcal{S}_a(B^{-1}) \circ (\lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_a(\mathrm{pr}_2) - \mathcal{S}_a(\widetilde{f_2}))\big)\,.$$

In view of Lemma 5.3 (a) and (e), Lemma 5.4 (a) and Proposition 5.5, this formula shows that g is analytic and Lipschitz with $\mathrm{Lip}(g) < 1$. Then

$$G \;:=\; \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{U}} - g \colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$$

is an analytic diffeomorphism and an isometry, by the Ultrametric Inverse Function Theorem (Theorem 2.4) and the domination principle (3). Now

$$w \colon B_r^{E_1}(0) \to \mathcal{U}\,, \quad w(x) := G^{-1}\big((x,0),(0,0),\ldots\big)$$

is an analytic map such that $(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{U}} - g)(w(x)) = G(w(x)) = ((x,0),(0,0),\ldots)$ and thus

$$w(x) = \big((x,0),(0,0),\ldots\big) + g(w(x)) \tag{35}$$

for all $x \in B_r^{E_1}(0)$. Comparing the 0-th component on both sides of (35), we see that $w(x)_0 = (x, 0) + \big(0, B^{-1}(\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_1) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(x)_0))\big)$ and thus

$$w(x)_0 = (x, \phi(x)),$$

where $\phi\colon B_r^{E_1}(0) \to B_r^{E_2}(0)$ is the analytic function given by

$$\phi(x) := B^{-1}(\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_1) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(x)_0)). \tag{36}$$

Then $\phi(0) = 0$, and since

$$g'(0) = \big(\rho \circ \mathcal{S}_a(A) \circ \mathcal{S}_a(\mathrm{pr}_1),\, \mathcal{S}_a(B^{-1}) \circ \lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_a(\mathrm{pr}_2)) = D_1 \oplus D_2$$

with $D_1 := \rho \circ \mathcal{S}_a(A) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_a(E_1))$ and $D_2 := \mathcal{S}_a(B^{-1}) \circ \lambda \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_a(E_2))$ of operator norm < 1 (cf. proof of Proposition 5.5), we have

$$(G^{-1})'(0) = (G'(0))^{-1} = (\mathrm{id} - (D_1 \oplus D_2))^{-1} = \mathrm{id} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_1^k \oplus D_2^k$$

and thus $w'(0).y = (G^{-1})'(0).\big((y, 0), (0, 0), \ldots\big) = ((y, 0), (Ay, 0), (A^2 y, 0), \ldots)$ for all $y \in E_1$, entailing that

$$\phi'(0) = 0.$$

We claim that $w(x)$ *is the* f*-orbit of* $w(x)_0 = (x, \phi(x))$*, for each* $x \in B_r^{E_1}(0)$*.* If this is true, then $w(x) \in \mathcal{U}$ implies that $a^{-n}\|f^n(x, \phi(x))\| = a^{-n}\|w(x)_n\|$ is $< r$ and tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$, showing that $(x, \phi(x)) \in \Gamma$ and hence

$$\mathrm{graph}(\phi) \subseteq \Gamma.$$

To prove the claim, we need only show that $w(x)_{n+1} = f(w(x)_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (because $w(x)_0 = (x, \phi(x))$). Looking at the second component of the entry in (35) indexed by n and the first component of the entry indexed by $n + 1$, we see that

$$\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_n) = B^{-1}(\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_{n+1}) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(x)_n) \tag{37}$$

and $\mathrm{pr}_1(w(x)_{n+1}) = f_1(w(x)_n)$. Multiplying (37) with B, we obtain

$$B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_n) = \mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_{n+1}) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(x)_n),$$

whence $\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_{n+1}) = B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(w(x)_n) + \widetilde{f}_2(w(x)_n) = f_2(w(x)_n)$. Thus $w(x)_{n+1} = f(w(x)_n)$, confirming the claim.

For a full proof of (b), it only remains to show that $\Gamma \subseteq \operatorname{graph}(\phi)$. To prove this inclusion, let $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$. Then $z := (f^n(z_0))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{U}$ (since $a^{-n}\|f^n(z_0)\| < r$ and $a^{-n}\|f^n(z_n)\| \to 0$ by definition of Γ). We claim that

$$z = ((x_0, 0), (0,0), \ldots) + g(z)\,. \tag{38}$$

If this is true, then $G(z) = z - g(z) = ((x_0, 0), (0,0), \ldots)$ and hence $z = G^{-1}((x_0, 0), (0,0), \ldots) = w(x_0)$. As a consequence, $z_0 = w(x_0)_0 = (x_0, \phi(x_0))$ and thus $z_0 \in \operatorname{graph}(\phi)$. To prove the claim, note first that $\operatorname{pr}_1(z_0) = x_0$, which is also the first component of the 0-th entry of the right hand side of (38). Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, equality of the first component of the index n entry of the sequences on the left and right of (38) means that

$$\operatorname{pr}_1(z_n) = f_1(z_{n-1})\,,$$

which is valid since $z_n = f^n(z_0) = f(f^{n-1}(z_0)) = f(z_{n-1})$. Next, we use that $\operatorname{pr}_2(z_n) = \operatorname{pr}_2(f(z_{n-1})) = B\operatorname{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) + \widetilde{f}_2(z_{n-1})$, whence $B\operatorname{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) = \operatorname{pr}_2(z_n) - \widetilde{f}_2(z_{n-1})$ and hence

$$\operatorname{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) = B^{-1}(\operatorname{pr}_2(z_n) - \widetilde{f}_2(z_{n-1}))\,.$$

Therefore the second components of the $(n-1)$st entries of the sequences on the left and right of (38) coincide. As n was arbitrary, (38) holds.

(c) Given $x, y \in B_r^{E_1}(0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi(x)-\phi(y)\| &\leq \|(x,\phi(x))-(y,\phi(y))\| = \|w(x)_0 - w(y)_0\| \leq \|w(x)-w(y)\|_a \\
&= \|G^{-1}((x,0),(0,0),\ldots) - G^{-1}((y,0),(0,0),\ldots)\|_a \\
&= \|((x-y,0),(0,0),\ldots)\|_a = \|x-y\|,
\end{aligned}$$

using that G is an isometry.

(d) Let b be a real number such that $\|A\| < b < \frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}$ and $\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}) < b$; after interchanging a and b if necessary, we may assume that $b \leq a$. Let Γ' be the set of all $z \in B_r^E(0)$ such that $f^n(z)$ is defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $b^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| < r$ and $b^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Then also $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| < r$ and $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| \to 0$, whence $z \in \Gamma$. Thus $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$. Since each of Γ' and Γ is the graph of a function on the same domain (by (b)), it follows that $\Gamma = \Gamma'$.

(e) Given $s \in \,]0, r]$, let Γ_s be the set of all $z \in B_s^E(0)$ such that $(f|_{B_s^E(0)})^n(z)$ is defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| < s$, and $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Applying (b) to $f|_{B_s^E(0)}$ instead of f, we find that Γ_s is the graph of a function

$\psi\colon B_s^{E_1}(0)\to B_s^{E_2}(0)$. Since $\Gamma_s\subseteq\Gamma$, it follows that ψ is the restriction of ϕ to $B_s^{E_1}(0)$ and $\Gamma\cap B_s^E(0)=\Gamma_s$. Since Γ_s has been obtained in the same way as Γ, it has analogous properties.

(f) After replacing a by an element in $]b,\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}[$ (which is legitimate by (d)), we may assume that $b<a<\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}$. Given $z\in\Gamma$, let $c\in\,]b,\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}[$ and $s\in\,]\|z\|,r]$. Then $z\in\Gamma_s$ (by (e) and its proof), and since the latter can be obtained using c in place of a (by (d)), it follows that $\|f^n(z)\|<c^n s$ for each $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Letting $c\to b$ and $s\to\|z\|$, it follows that $\|f^n(z)\|\leq b^n\|z\|$ for each $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Hence z belongs to the final set described in (f). This set, in turn, is a subset of the penultimate set occurring in (f) (as is clear from the definition of these sets). To complete the proof, let $z\in B_r^E(0)$ be in the penultimate set; thus $f^n(z)$ is defined for each $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and $\|f^n(z)\|\leq b^n r$, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Then $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\|\leq\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^n r$, where $\frac{b}{a}<1$. Thus $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\|<r$ and $a^{-n}\|f^n(z)\|\to 0$, whence $z\in\Gamma$. Therefore all three sets in (f) coincide.

(g) For each $z=(x,\phi(x))\in\Gamma$, we have

$$\|z\|=\max\{\|x\|,\|\phi(x)\|\}=\|x\|\,, \tag{39}$$

because $\phi(0)=0$ and $\operatorname{Lip}(\phi)\leq 1$ (by (c)). Since $f(z)\in\Gamma$ by (a), we deduce that $\|f(z)\|=\|(f_1(z),\phi(f_1(z)))\|=\|f_1(z)\|=\|Ax+\widetilde{f}_1(z)\|\leq\max\{\|Ax\|,\|\widetilde{f}_1(z)\|\}\leq c\|x\|$, using that $\|\widetilde{f}_1(z)\|\leq\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}_1)\|z\|=\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}_1)\|x\|$.

(h) The map $\kappa\colon\Gamma\mapsto B_r^{E_1}(0)$, $(x,y)\mapsto x$ is a global chart for the submanifold Γ of E, with inverse $\kappa^{-1}\colon B_r^{E_1}(0)\to\Gamma$, $x\mapsto(x,\phi(x))$. The map $\kappa\circ f\circ\kappa^{-1}\colon B_r^{E_1}(0)\to E_1$ takes $x\in B_r^{E_1}(0)$ to

$$(\kappa\circ f\circ\kappa^{-1})(x)=f_1(x,\phi(x))=Ax+\widetilde{f}_1(x,\phi(x))$$

with $\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}_1\circ(\mathrm{id},\phi))\leq\operatorname{Lip}(\widetilde{f}_1)<\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}$. By the Ultrametric Inverse Function Theorem (Theorem 2.4), $\kappa\circ f\circ\kappa^{-1}$ has open image and is a diffeomorphism onto its image, from which the assertion follows. $\square$

Remark 6.3 Note that the mere existence of an analytic function ϕ with $\operatorname{graph}(\phi)\subseteq\Gamma$ remains valid if B is not invertible, but merely admits a right inverse C such that $\frac{1}{\|C\|}>a$ (simply replace B^{-1} by C in the proof of (b)). However, if B is not invertible, it can happen that $\operatorname{graph}(\phi)$ is a proper subset of Γ (as the following example shows). Thus Wells [40] was mistaken when he thought that equality can always be achieved in his Theorem 1.

Example 6.4 Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a complete ultrametric field, $a := \frac{1}{2}$, $E_1 := \{0\}$, $A := 0$, $E := E_2 := c_0 := \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{K})$, and $f := B := \lambda$ be the left shift on c_0, which admits the right shift $C := \rho$ as a right inverse, with $\frac{1}{\|C\|} = 1 > a$. Then, for any $r > 0$, the set Γ defined in (33) coincides with the ball $B_r^{\mathcal{S}_a(\mathbb{K})}(0)$, which certainly is not the graph of a function on $E_1 = \{0\}$. The same pathology occurs if we replace $\mathbb{K}$ by the field $\mathbb{R}$ of real numbers.

As a first step towards Theorem 1.3, we now use the preceding results to construct local a-stable manifolds for locally defined maps on a manifold.

Definition 6.5 In the situation of 1.6 (with $a \in \,]0,1]$), assume that $T_p(f)$ is a-hyperbolic. We call an immersed submanifold $N \subseteq M_0$ a *local a-stable manifold* around p with respect to f if (a), (c) and (d) from Definition 1.7 are satisfied as well as

(b)$''$ N is tangent at p to the a-stable subspace $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, i.e., $T_p(N) = T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{s}}$.

If $a = 1$, we simply speak of a *local stable manifold*.

Before we discuss this concept, let us clarify two related points mentioned in the introduction.

Remark 6.6 $E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ is uniquely determined in the situation of Definition 1.2, and if α is an automorphism of E, then also $E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ is determined (by the argument given in Remark 4.3).

The second point concerns Definition 1.2.

Remark 6.7 Note that if (1) holds for one chart $\kappa\colon U \to V$ as described in Definition 1.2 and ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E defining its topology, then also for every other chart $\widetilde{\kappa}\colon \widetilde{U} \to \widetilde{V} \subseteq E$ and norm $\|.\|^{\sim}$ with analogous properties. In fact, since $\tau := \widetilde{\kappa} \circ \kappa^{-1}$ is analytic, it is Lipschitz on some 0-neighbourhood $W \subseteq V$. Moreover, there exists $D > 0$ such that $\|.\|^{\sim} \leq D\|.\|$. If $x \in M$ such that $f^n(x) \to p$ as $n \to \infty$ and $a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| \to 0$, then $f^n(x) \in \kappa^{-1}(W)$ for large n and thus $a^{-n}\|\widetilde{\kappa}(f^n(x))\|^{\sim} \leq a^{-n}D\|\tau(\kappa(f^n(x)))\| \leq D\,\mathrm{Lip}(\tau|_W)a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| \to 0$ (as required).

We can prove the following result on local a-stable manifolds.

Theorem 6.8 *Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field. Let $M_0 \subseteq M$ be open, $f\colon M_0 \to M$ be an analytic mapping and $p \in M_0$ be a fixed point of f, such that $T_p(f)$ is a-hyperbolic for some $a \in\,]0,1]$. Then the following holds:*

(a) *There exists a local a-stable manifold N around p with respect to f;*

(b) *The germ of N at p is uniquely determined;*

(c) *If N is a local a-stable manifold around p with respect to f, then every neighbourhood of p in N contains an open neighbourhood $\Omega \subseteq N$ which is local a-stable manifold around p, a submanifold of M, and has the following additional properties:*

  (i) *There exist a chart $\kappa\colon P \to U \subseteq T_p(M)$ of M_0 around p such that $\kappa(p) = 0$, an ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on $E := T_p(M)$ defining its topology, and an open neighbourhood $Q \subseteq P$ with $f(Q) \subseteq P$ and $\kappa(Q) = B_r^E(0)$ for some $r > 0$, such that $\Omega = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma)$ where*

$$\Gamma := \{z \in B_r^E(0)\colon g^n(z) \text{ is defined and } a^{-n}\|g^n(z)\| < r \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} a^{-n}\|g^n(z)\| = 0\},$$

  with $g := \kappa \circ f \circ \kappa^{-1}|_{B_r^E(0)}$.

  (ii) *$f^n(x) \to p$ for all $x \in \Omega$; and*

  (iii) *$a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, for each $x \in \Omega$ and some (and hence any) chart κ of M_0 around p, such that $\kappa(p) = 0$.*

Proof. (a) and (c): Let E_1 be the a-stable subspace and E_2 be the a-unstable subspace of $E := T_p(M)$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, and $\|.\|$ be a norm on $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ as in Definition 1.1. Let $\kappa\colon P \to U$, Q, $r > 0$ and $g\colon B_r^E(0) \to E$ be as in 3.2; thus $g'(0) = T_p(f)$. For $s \in\,]0,r]$, let Γ_s be the set of all $z \in B_s^E(0)$ such that $g^n(z)$ is defined and $a^{-n}\|g^n(z)\| < s$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} a^{-n}\|g^n(z)\| = 0$. After shrinking r if necessary, the construction of Section 6 can be applied with g in place of f (cf. Remark 2.5 (d)). Hence, there exists an analytic map

$$\phi\colon B_r^{E_1}(0) \to B_r^{E_2}(0)$$

with $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi'(0) = 0$, such that Γ_s is the graph of $\phi|_{B_s^{E_1}(0)}$ for each $s \in\,]0,r]$, and $g(\Gamma_s) \subseteq \Gamma_s$ (see Theorem 6.2). Then Γ_s is a submanifold of $B_s^E(0)$ and g restricts to an analytic map $\Gamma_s \to \Gamma_s$ for each $s \in \,]0,r]$. Now $\Omega_s := \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_s)$ is a submanifold of $\kappa^{-1}(B_s^E(0))$ (and hence of M), such that $f(\Omega_s) \subseteq \Omega_s$ and $f|_{\Omega_s}\colon \Omega_s \to \Omega_s$ is analytic. Also, $T_p(\Omega_s) = E_1$ because $T_0(\Gamma_s) = E_1$, and hence each Ω_s is a local a-stable manifold around p with respect to f. Moreover, the Ω_s with $s \in \,]0,r]$ form a basis of open neighbourhoods of p in Ω_r. Finally, $f^n(x) \to p$ holds for all $x \in \Omega_r$ and $a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| = a^{-n}\|g^n(\kappa(x))\| \to 0$ by definition of Γ_r (and we have analogous behaviour with respect to other charts and norms, by Remark 6.7). Thus (a) is established and (c) holds for $N = \Omega_r$ (and hence for any local a-stable manifold N, once we have (b)).

(b) We retain the notation from the proof of (a), let N be another local a-stable manifold around p with respect to f, and pick $b \in \,]\|A\|, a[$ with $A := (T_p(f))|_{E_1}$. Let $\mu\colon V \to B_\tau^{E_1}(0)$ be a chart of N around p such that $\mu(p) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_1}$. There is $\sigma \in \,]0,\tau]$ such that $h := \mu \circ f \circ \mu^{-1}$ is defined on all of $B_\sigma^{E_1}(0)$. Since $h'(0) = T_p(f|_N) = A$ with $\|A\| \leq b$, Remark 2.6 (a) shows that

$$h(B_s^{E_1}(0)) \;\subseteq\; B_{bs}^{E_1}(0) \;\subseteq\; B_s^{E_1}(0) \quad \text{for all } s \in \,]0,\sigma], \tag{40}$$

after possibly shrinking σ. Thus $\mu^{-1}(B_s^{E_1}(0))$ is a local a-stable manifold.

Now write $g = (g_1, g_2) = g'(0) + \widetilde{g}\colon B_r^E(0) \to E_1 \oplus E_2$, where $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{g}) < a$ and $g'(0) = A \oplus B$ with A as before and $\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|} > a$. Then $Q \cap N$ is an immersed submanifold of Q tangent to E_1. After replacing N by an f-invariant open p-neighbourhood in N (cf. (40)), we may assume that N is a submanifold of Q. Since $\kappa(N)$ is tangent to E_1 at $0 \in E$, the inverse function theorem implies that $\kappa(N)$ is the graph of an analytic map $\psi\colon W \to E_2$ on some open 0-neighbourhood $W \subseteq B_r^{E_1}(0)$, with $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\psi) \leq 1$ (after shrinking N if necessary). Then $\nu := \mathrm{pr}_1 \circ \kappa|_N$ is a chart for N with $\nu(p) = 0$ and $d\nu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_1}$ (where $\mathrm{pr}_1\colon E_1 \oplus E_2 \to E_1$). Hence, by the discussion leading to (40), there exists $\sigma \in \,]0,r]$ such that $B_\sigma^{E_1}(0) \subseteq W$ and

$$g(\Theta_s) \;\subseteq\; \Theta_{bs} \quad \text{for all } s \in \,]0,\sigma], \tag{41}$$

where $\Theta_s := \{(x, \psi(x))\colon x \in B_s^{E_1}(0)\}$ for $s \in \,]0,\sigma]$. Note that $\|z\| = \|x\| < s$ for all $s \in \,]0,\sigma]$ and $z = (x, \psi(x)) \in \Theta_s$, since $\mathrm{Lip}(\psi) \leq 1$. By (41), $g^n(x, \psi(x))$ is defined for each $x \in B_\sigma^{E_1}(0)$. Moreover, $\|g^n(x,\psi(x))\| < b^n\sigma$ (since $g^n(x,\psi(x)) \in \Theta_{b^n\sigma}$), entailing that $a^{-n}\|g^n(x,\psi(x))\| < \sigma$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $a^{-n}\|g^n(x,\psi(x)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence $\Theta_\sigma \subseteq \Gamma_\sigma$ and since both sets are graphs of functions on the same domain, it follows that $\Theta_\sigma = \Gamma_\sigma$. Hence Θ_σ is an open submanifold of Γ_r. Then Ω_σ is an open submanifold of Ω_r which contains p, and it is also an open submanifold of N because $\Omega_\sigma = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_\sigma) = \kappa^{-1}(\Theta_\sigma) = \nu^{-1}(B^{E_1}_\sigma(0))$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Note that, in contrast to Theorem 1.3, $T_p(f)$ is not assumed to be an automorphism in Theorem 6.8.

7 Global stable manifolds

We now prove Theorem 1.3 from the introduction.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $r > 0$, E, κ, Q with $\kappa(Q) = B^E_r(0)$, g and the submanifolds $\kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_s)$ of M (for $s \in \,]0, r]$) be as in the proof of Theorem 6.8 (c). By Theorem 6.2 (h) and Remark 2.5 (d), we may assume that $g(\Gamma)$ is an open subset of $\Gamma := \Gamma_r$ and $g|_\Gamma\colon \Gamma \to g(\Gamma)$ is an analytic diffeomorphism. Then $\Omega = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma)$ is a submanifold of M which is tangent to $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ at p, the image $f(\Omega)$ is open in Ω, and f restricts to a diffeomorphism $\Omega \to f(\Omega)$. We now show that

$$W^{\mathrm{s}}_a = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} f^{-n}(\Omega)\,. \tag{42}$$

By (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 6.8 (c), we have $\Omega \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a$ and hence $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} f^{-n}(\Omega) \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a$, recalling that $f(W^{\mathrm{s}}_a) = W^{\mathrm{s}}_a$.

Conversely, suppose that $x \in W^s_a$. Then, by the definition of W^s_a (and Remark 6.7), there is $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $f^n(x) \in Q$ for all $n \geq m$ and $a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| \to 0$. After increasing m if necessary, we may assume that $a^{-n}\|\kappa(f^n(x))\| < r$ for all $n \geq m$. Then

$$a^{-k}\|\kappa(f^k(f^m(x)))\| \;\leq\; a^{-(k+m)}\|\kappa(f^{k+m}(x))\| \;<\; r$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $a^{-k}\|g^k(\kappa(f^m(x)))\| = a^{-k}\|\kappa(f^{k+m}(x))\| \to 0$, showing that $\kappa(f^m(x)) \in \Gamma$. Therefore $f^m(x) \in \Omega$ and thus $x \in f^{-m}(\Omega) \subseteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} f^{-n}(\Omega)$, completing the proof of (42).

Since Ω is a submanifold of M and f a diffeomorphism, also $\Omega_n := f^n(\Omega)$ is a submanifold of M, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Because $f(\Omega)$ is an open submanifold of Ω and f restricts to a diffeomorphism from Ω to $f(\Omega)$, it follows that Ω_m is an open submanifold of Ω_n, for all $m \geq n$, and that the map

$$h_{m,n}\colon \Omega_n \to \Omega_m$$

induced by f^{m-n} is a diffeomorphism. We give W_a^{s} the unique analytic manifold structure making each Ω_n an open submanifold of W_a^{s}. Since each Ω_n is open in W_a^{s} and the inclusion map $\Omega_n \to M$ is an immersion, W_a^{s} is an immersed submanifold of M. Moreover, $T_p(W_a^{\mathrm{s}}) = T_p(\Omega)$ is the a-stable subspace of $T_p(M)$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, and $f(W_a^{\mathrm{s}}) = W_a^{\mathrm{s}}$. The restriction h of f to a map $W_a^{\mathrm{s}} \to W_a^{\mathrm{s}}$ is analytic, because $h|_{\Omega_n} = \lambda_{n+1} \circ h_{n+1,n}$ is analytic for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (where $\lambda_n \colon \Omega_n \to W_a^{\mathrm{s}}$ is the inclusion map). Also h^{-1} is analytic, because $h^{-1}|_{\Omega_n} = \lambda_{n-1} \circ (h_{n,n-1})^{-1}$ is analytic. Thus, the existence part of Theorem 1.3 is established. Moreover, the final assertion holds because Ω might be replaced by its open subset $\kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_s)$ for each $s \in \,]0, r]$.

Uniqueness: We let W_a^{s} be the manifold just constructed and write N for W_a^{s}, equipped with any manifold structure for which conditions (a)–(c) of the theorem are satisfied. Then both N and W_a^{s} are local a-stable manifolds. Hence, there is an open neighbourhood $W \subseteq N$ of p which is also an open neighbourhood of p in W_a^{s}, and on which N and W_a^{s} induce the same analytic manifold structure (Theorem 6.8 (b)). Let $\Omega \subseteq W$ be as before. Since f^n restricts to diffeomorphism of both W_a^{s} and N, it follows that $f^{-n}(\Omega)$ is an open submanifold of both W_a^{s} and N (with the same induced analytic manifold structure), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since the sets $f^{-n}(\Omega)$ form an open cover of W_a^{s} and N, it follows that $W_a^{\mathrm{s}} = N$ as an analytic manifold. $\square$

8 Local unstable manifolds

We construct local unstable manifolds by an adaptation of Irwin's method (cf. also [40]). Our general setting is the following:

8.1 Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field. Let $M_0 \subseteq M$ be open, $f \colon M_0 \to M$ be analytic, $a > 0$ and p be a fixed point of f such that $T_p(f)$ is a-hyperbolic.

Definition 8.2 In the situation of 8.1, an immersed submanifold $N \subseteq M_0$ is called a *local a-unstable manifold* around p with respect to f if (a)–(c) hold:

(a) $p \in N$;

(b) N is tangent at p to the a-unstable subspace $T_p(M)_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ of $T_p(M)$ with respect to $T_p(f)$;

(c) There exists an open neighbourhood U of p in N such that $f(U) \subseteq N$ and $f|_U \colon U \to N$ is analytic.

We can show:

Theorem 8.3 *If* $a \geq 1$ *in the situation of* 8.1*, then the following holds:*

(a) *There exists a local* a*-unstable manifold* N *around* p *with respect to* f*;*

(b) *The germ of* N *at* p *is uniquely determined.*

Remark 8.4 If $T_p(f)$ is invertible, we may assume that $M_1 := f(M_0)$ is open and $f \colon M_0 \to M_1$ a diffeomorphism, after possibly shrinking M_0. Now Theorem 6.8 provides a local $\frac{1}{a}$-stable manifold $N \subseteq M_0 \cap M_1$ around p with respect to $f^{-1} \colon M_1 \to M$. Then N is a local a-unstable manifold with respect to f. Hence, we already have most of Theorem 8.3 if $T_p(f)$ is invertible. The interesting point is that the theorem remains valid if $T_p(f)$ is not invertible.

Because the proof of Theorem 8.3 is quite similar to that of Theorem 6.8, we relegate it to an appendix (Appendix B).

9 Spectral interpretation of hyperbolicity

In this section, we consider the special case where α is an automorphism of a *finite-dimensional* vector space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$. We shall interpret a-hyperbolicity as the absence of eigenvalues of absolute value a (in an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{K}$). Moreover, we shall see that an a-centre subspace and an a-centre-stable subspace always exist.

9.1 Let $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ be a complete ultrametric field, E be a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-vector space, and $\alpha \colon E \to E$ be a linear map. We let $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ be an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{K}$, and use the same symbol, $|.|$, for the unique extension of the given absolute value to $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ (see [34, Theorem 16.1]). We let $R(\alpha)$ be the set of all absolute values $|\lambda|$, where $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}$ is an eigenvalue of the $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$-linear self-map $\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} := \alpha \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ of the $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$-vector space $E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} := E \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \overline{\mathbb{K}}$ obtained from E by extension of scalars. For each $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}$, we let

$$(E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_{(\lambda)} := \{x \in E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} \colon (\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} - \lambda)^d x = 0\}$$

be the generalized eigenspace of $\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in $E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ corresponding to λ (where d is the dimension of the $\mathbb{K}$-vector space E). Given $\rho \in [0,\infty[$, we define

$$(E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_\rho \; := \; \bigoplus_{|\lambda|=\rho} (E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_{(\lambda)}\,, \tag{43}$$

where the sum is taken over all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}$ such that $|\lambda| = \rho$.

The following fact (cf. (1.0) on p. 81 in [31, Chapter II]) is important:[10]

Lemma 9.2 *For each $\rho \in R(\alpha)$, the vector subspace $(E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_\rho$ of $E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ is defined over $\mathbb{K}$, i.e., $(E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_\rho = (E_\rho)_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ with $E_\rho := (E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})_\rho \cap E$. Thus*

$$E \; = \; \bigoplus_{\rho \in R(\alpha)} E_\rho\,, \tag{44}$$

and each E_ρ is an α-invariant vector subspace of E. $\square$

It is essential for us that certain well-behaved norms exist on E (as in 9.1).

Definition 9.3 A norm $\|.\|$ on E is *adapted to* α if the following holds:

(a) $\|.\|$ is ultrametric;

(b) $\big\|\sum_{\rho\in R(\alpha)} x_\rho\big\| = \max\{\|x_\rho\| \colon \rho \in R(\alpha)\}$ for each $(x_\rho)_{\rho\in R(\alpha)} \in \prod_{\rho\in R(\alpha)} E_\rho$; and

(c) $\|\alpha(x)\| = \rho\|x\|$ for each $0 \neq \rho \in R(\alpha)$ and $x \in E_\rho$.

Proposition 9.4 *Let E be a finite-dimensional vector space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ and $\alpha\colon E \to E$ be a linear map. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $E_0 := \{x \in E \colon (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})\ \alpha^n(x) = 0\}$. Then E admits a norm $\|.\|$ adapted to α, such that $\alpha|_{E_0}$ has operator norm $< \varepsilon$ with respect to $\|.\|$.*

The proof uses [21, Lemma 4.4] (the proof of which does not require that α is an automorphism, as assumed in [21]):

Lemma 9.5 *For each $\rho \in R(\alpha) \setminus \{0\}$, there exists an ultrametric norm $\|.\|_\rho$ on E_ρ such that $\|\alpha(x)\|_\rho = \rho\|x\|_\rho$ for each $x \in E_\rho$.* $\square$

The next lemma takes care of the case $\rho = 0$.

---

[10] In [31, p. 81], $\mathbb{K}$ is a local field, but the proof works also for complete ultrametric fields.

Lemma 9.6 *Let E be a finite-dimensional vector space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$ and $\alpha\colon E \to E$ be a nilpotent linear map. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E with respect to which α has operator norm $< \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Assume first that there exists a basis $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ of E with respect to which α has Jordan normal form with a single Jordan block, i.e., $\alpha(v_1) = 0$ and $\alpha(v_k) = v_{k-1}$ for $k \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$. The case $E = \{0\}$ being trivial, we may assume that $m \geq 1$. Choose $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $0 < |\lambda| < \varepsilon$ and define $w_k := \lambda^k v_k$ for $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then $\alpha(w_k) = \lambda^k v_{k-1} = \lambda w_{k-1}$ for $k \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$ and $\alpha(w_1) = 0$, entailing that α has operator norm $< \varepsilon$ with respect to the maximum norm $\|.\|$ on E with respect to the basis $w_1, \ldots, w_m$,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{m} t_k w_k \right\| \;:=\; \max\{|t_k|\colon k = 1, \ldots, m\} \quad \text{for } \; t_1, \ldots, t_m \in \mathbb{K}.$$

In the general case, we write E as a direct sum $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} E_j$ of α-invariant vector subspaces $E_j \subseteq E$ such that the Jordan decomposition of $\alpha|_{E_j}$ has a single Jordan block. For each j, there exists an ultrametric norm $\|.\|_j$ on E_j with respect to which $\alpha|_{E_j}$ has operator norm $< \varepsilon$, by the above special case. Then α has operator norm $< \varepsilon$ with respect to the ultrametric norm $\|.\|$ on E given by $\|v_1 + \cdots + v_n\| := \max\{\|v_j\|_j \colon j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ for $v_j \in E_j$. □

Proof of Proposition 9.4. For each $\rho \in R(\alpha) \setminus \{0\}$, we choose a norm $\|.\|_\rho$ on E_ρ as described in Lemma 9.5. Lemma 9.6 provides an ultrametric norm $\|.\|_0$ on E_0, with respect to which $\alpha|_{E_0}$ has operator norm $< \varepsilon$. Then

$$\Big\| \sum_{\rho \in R(\alpha)} x_\rho \Big\| \;:=\; \max\,\big\{\, \|x_\rho\|_\rho \colon \rho \in R(\alpha) \,\big\} \quad \text{for } \; (x_\rho)_{\rho \in R(\alpha)} \in \textstyle\prod_{\rho \in R(\alpha)} E_\rho$$

defines a norm $\|.\|\colon E \to [0, \infty[$ which, by construction, is adapted to α and with respect to which $\alpha|_{E_0}$ has operator norm $< \varepsilon$. □

In the finite-dimensional case, the next corollary (and its proof) provide lucid interpretations for a-hyperbolicity, and also for a-centre-stable and a-centre subspaces.

Corollary 9.7 *Let E be a finite-dimensional vector space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$. Let $\alpha\colon E \to E$ be a linear map, $R(\alpha)$ be as in* 9.1, *and $a > 0$. Then the following holds:*

(a) *E admits an a-centre-stable subspace with respect to α.*

(b) *If α is invertible, then E admits an a-centre subspace with respect to α.*

(c) *α is a-hyperbolic if and only if $a \notin R(\alpha)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 9.4, there exists an ultrametric norm $\|.\|^{\sim}$ on E which is adapted to α, and with respect to which $\alpha|_{E_0}$ has operator norm $< a$.

(a) The conditions from Definition 1.4 are satisfied with $\|.\| := \|.\|^{\sim}$ and

$$E_{a,\mathrm{cs}} := \bigoplus_{\rho \leq a} E_\rho \quad \text{and} \quad E_{a,\mathrm{u}} := \bigoplus_{\rho > a} E_\rho\,. \tag{45}$$

(b) The conditions of Definition 1.5 are satisfied with $\|.\| := \|.\|^{\sim}$ and

$$E_{a,\mathrm{s}} := \bigoplus_{\rho < a} E_\rho, \quad E_{a,\mathrm{c}} := E_a, \qquad \text{and} \quad E_{a,\mathrm{u}} := \bigoplus_{\rho > a} E_\rho\,. \tag{46}$$

(c) If $a \notin R(\alpha)$, then the conditions of Definition 1.1 are satisfied with $\|.\| := \|.\|^{\sim}$ and

$$E_{a,\mathrm{s}} := \bigoplus_{\rho < a} E_\rho \qquad \text{and} \quad E_{a,\mathrm{u}} := \bigoplus_{\rho > a} E_\rho\,. \tag{47}$$

If $a \in R(\alpha)$, then α cannot be a-hyperbolic. In fact, if α was a-hyperbolic, we obtain a norm $\|.\|$ and a splitting $E = E_{a,\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$ as in Definition 1.1. Let $\alpha_1 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{s}}}$ and $\alpha_2 := \alpha|_{E_{a,\mathrm{u}}}$. Since $\|.\|$ and $\|.\|^{\sim}$ are equivalent, there exists $C > 0$ such that $C^{-1}\|.\| \leq \|.\|^{\sim} \leq C\|.\|$. Let $0 \neq v \in E_a$. Write $v = x + y$ with $x \in E_{a,\mathrm{s}}$ and $y \in E_{a,\mathrm{u}}$. If $y \neq 0$, then

$$\|v\|^{\sim} = a^{-n}\|\alpha^n(v)\|^{\sim} \geq a^{-n}C^{-1}\|\alpha^n(v)\| \geq C^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{a\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|}\right)^n \|y\|$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is absurd because $\frac{1}{a\|\alpha_2^{-1}\|} > 1$. Hence $y = 0$ and thus $x = v \neq 0$. But then

$$\|v\|^{\sim} = a^{-n}\|\alpha^n(v)\|^{\sim} \leq a^{-n}C\|\alpha^n(v)\| \leq C\left(\frac{\|\alpha_1\|}{a}\right)^n \|v\| \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\frac{\|\alpha_1\|}{a} < 1$, this is absurd. Thus α cannot be a-hyperbolic. □

Remark 9.8 If E is an infinite-dimensional Banach space over a complete ultrametric field and $\alpha\colon E \to E$ an automorphism, let $E_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ be the completed projective tensor product $E \mathbin{\overline{\otimes}}_{\mathbb{K}} \overline{\mathbb{K}}$ (which is an ultrametric Banach space over $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$) and $\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} := \alpha \mathbin{\overline{\otimes}} \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$. It is natural to define $R(\alpha) := \{|\lambda|\colon \lambda \in \sigma(\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})\}$ in this case, where $\sigma(\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}})$ is the set of all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{K}}$ such that $\alpha_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}} - \lambda\,\mathrm{id}$ is not invertible. The author conjectures that α is a-hyperbolic if and only if $a \notin R(\alpha)$, and moreover that E has an a-centre-stable subspace (resp., an a-centre subspace) if and only if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $]a, a+\varepsilon[\, \cap R(\alpha) = \emptyset$ (resp., $]a, a+\varepsilon[\, \cap R(\alpha) = \emptyset$ and $]a-\varepsilon, a[\, \cap R(\alpha) = \emptyset$). These topics require further investigation. The functional calculus from [13] should be useful.

10 Behaviour close to a fixed point

We now relate the behaviour of a dynamical system (M, f) around a fixed point p and properties of the linear map $T_p(f)$. The results (and those from Sections 11 through 13) are useful for Lie theory (see [20] and [22]; cf. [21]).

10.1 Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$. Let $f\colon M_0 \to M$ be an analytic mapping on an open subset $M_0 \subseteq M$ and $p \in M_0$ be a fixed point of f, such that $T_p(f)\colon T_p(M) \to T_p(M)$ is an automorphism.

Proposition 10.2 *In* 10.1*, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *$T_p(M)$ admits a centre-stable subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, and each neighbourhood P of p in M_0 contains a neighbourhood Q of p such that $f(Q) \subseteq Q$.*

(b) *There exists a norm $\|.\|$ on $T_p(M)$ defining its topology, such that $\|T_p(f)\| \leq 1$ holds for the corresponding operator norm.*

If, moreover, M is a finite-dimensional manifold, then (a) *and* (b) *are also equivalent to the following condition:*

(c) *Each eigenvalue λ of $T_p(f) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ has absolute value $|\lambda| \leq 1$.*

Proof. (b) means that $E := T_p(M)$ coincides with its centre-stable subspace with respect to $\alpha := T_p(f)$. If E is finite-dimensional, this property is equivalent to $R(\alpha) \subseteq\,]0, 1]$ and hence to (c), by Remark 3.3 and (45). If (b) holds, then (a) follows with Theorem 1.9 (c).

(a)$\Rightarrow$(b): If (a) holds, then E admits a decomposition $E = E_{1,\mathrm{cs}} \oplus E_{1,\mathrm{u}}$ and a norm $\|.\|$, as described in Definition 1.4 (with $a = 1$). After shrinking M_0, we may assume that $M_1 := f(M_0)$ is open in M and $f\colon M_0 \to M_1$ is a diffeomorphism (by the Inverse Function Theorem).

If $E_{1,\mathrm{u}} \neq \{0\}$, we let $P \subseteq M_0 \cap M_1$ be an open neighbourhood of p such that $f(P) \subseteq P$, and consider the map $g := f^{-1}\colon M_1 \to M$. Then $E_{1,\mathrm{u}}$ is the stable subspace of E with respect to $T_p(g) = \alpha^{-1}$. Pick $b \in \,]\|\alpha^{-1}|_{E_{1,\mathrm{u}}}\|, 1[$. Then α^{-1} is b-hyperbolic, and

$$E_{b,\mathrm{s}} = E_{1,\mathrm{u}} \quad \text{as well as} \quad E_{b,\mathrm{u}} = E_{1,\mathrm{cs}}$$

(with respect to the automorphisms α^{-1} and α on the left and right of the equality signs, respectively). By Theorem 6.8 (applied to $g|_P\colon P \to M$), there exists a local b-stable manifold $N \subseteq P$ with respect to g, such that $g^n(x) \to p$ as $n \to \infty$, for all $x \in N$. Since N is tangent to $E_{1,\mathrm{u}} \neq \{0\}$, we have $N \neq \{p\}$ and thus find a point $x \in N \setminus \{p\}$. By hypothesis (a), there is an open p-neighbourhood $Q \subseteq P \setminus \{x\}$ with $f(Q) \subseteq Q$. Since $g^n(x) \to p$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $y := g^m(x) \in Q$. Then $x = f^m(y) \in f^m(Q) \subseteq Q$, contradicting the choice of Q. Hence $E_{1,u} = \{0\}$ (and thus (b) holds). $\square$

Proposition 10.3 *In* 10.1, *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *$T_p(M)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, and each neighbourhood P of p in M_0 contains a neighbourhood Q of p such that $f(Q) = Q$.*

(b) *There exists a norm $\|.\|$ on $T_p(M)$ defining its topology, which makes $T_p(f)$ an isometry.*

If, moreover, M is a finite-dimensional manifold, then (a) *and* (b) *are also equivalent to the following condition:*

(c) *Each eigenvalue λ of $T_p(f) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ has absolute value $|\lambda| = 1$.*

Proof. (b) means that $E := T_p(M)$ coincides with its centre subspace with respect to $\alpha := T_p(f)$. If E is finite-dimensional, this property is equivalent to $R(\alpha) \subseteq \{1\}$ and hence to (c), by Remark 4.3 and (46). If (b) holds, then (a) follows with Theorem 1.10 (c).

(a)$\Rightarrow$(b): After shrinking M_0, we may assume that $M_1 := f(M_0)$ is open in M and $f\colon M_0 \to M_1$ is a diffeomorphism. If (a) holds, then there is a decomposition $E = E_{1,\mathrm{s}} \oplus E_{1,\mathrm{c}} \oplus E_{1,\mathrm{u}}$ and a norm $\|.\|$, as in Definition 1.5 (with $a = 1$). By "(a)$\Rightarrow$(b)" in Proposition 10.2, we have $E_{1,\mathrm{u}} = \{0\}$. Applying Proposition 10.2 to $g := f^{-1}\colon M_1 \to M$, we see that also $E_{1,\mathrm{s}} = \{0\}$ (because this is the unstable subspace of $T_p(M)$ with respect to $T_p(g) = \alpha^{-1}$). Thus $E = E_{1,\mathrm{c}}$, establishing (b). □

The proofs show that Q can always be chosen as an open subset of M_0, in part (a) of Proposition 10.2 and 10.3.

Definition 10.4 In the situation of 10.1, we use the following terminology:

(a) p is said to be an *attractive* fixed point of f if p has a neighbourhood $P \subseteq M_0$ such that $f^n(x)$ is defined for all $x \in P$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} f^n(x) = p$ for all $x \in P$.

(b) We say that p is *uniformly attractive* if it is attractive and, moreover, every neighbourhood of p in M_0 contains a neighbourhood Q of p such that $f(Q) \subseteq Q$.

Proposition 10.5 *In* 10.1*, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *$T_p(M)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, and p is uniformly attractive;*

(b) *There exists a norm $\|.\|$ on $T_p(M)$ defining its topology, such that $\|T_p(f)\| < 1$ holds for the corresponding operator norm.*

If, moreover, M is a finite-dimensional manifold, then (a) *and* (b) *are also equivalent to the following condition:*

(c) *Each eigenvalue λ of $T_p(f) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ has absolute value $|\lambda| < 1$.*

Proof. (b) means that $E := T_p(M)$ coincides with its stable subspace with respect to $\alpha := T_p(f)$. If E is finite-dimensional, this property is equivalent to $R(\alpha) \subseteq \,]0,1[$ and hence to (c), by Remark 6.6 and (46). If (b) holds and $P \subseteq M_0$ is an open neighbourhood of p, then Theorem 6.8 (applied to $f|_P$ instead of f) provides a local stable manifold $N \subseteq P$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f^n(x) = p$ for all $x \in N$. Because $T_p(N) = E = T_p(M)$, it follows that N is open in M.

Since, moreover, $f(N) \subseteq N$ by definition of N, we have verifed that p is uniformly attractive. $\square$

Remark 10.6 If p is merely attractive (but possibly not uniformly) and $E := T_p(M)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, we can still conclude that $E_{1,\mathrm{c}} = \{0\}$.

[After shrinking M_0, we may assume that f is injective. Let $P \subseteq M_0$ be as in Definition 10.4 (a). If $E_{1,\mathrm{c}} \neq \{0\}$, we let $Q \subseteq P$ be a centre manifold with respect to f, such that $f(Q) = Q$ (see Theorem 1.10 (c)). Since $E_{1,\mathrm{c}} \neq \{0\}$, we must have $Q \neq \{p\}$, enabling us to pick $x_0 \in Q \setminus \{p\}$. Using Theorem 1.10 (c) again, we find a centre manifold $S \subseteq Q \setminus \{x_0\}$ with respect to f, such that $f(S) = S$. Since f is injective, it follows that $f(Q \setminus S) = Q \setminus S$ and thus $f^n(x_0) \in Q \setminus S$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. As Q is a neighbourhood of p, we infer $f^n(x_0) \not\to p$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $x_0 \in P$, this contradicts the choice of P.]

11 When $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p)$ is not only immersed

In general, W^{s}_a is only an *immersed* submanifold of M, not a submanifold (cf. [21, §7.1] for an easy example). We now describe a criterion (needed in [20]) which prevents such pathologies.

Proposition 11.1 *Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field. Let $p \in M$ be a fixed point of an analytic diffeomorphism $f\colon M \to M$, such that $E := T_p(M)$ admits a centre-stable subspace with respect to $T_p(f)$, and $E_{1,\mathrm{u}} = \{0\}$. Then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p)$ is a submanifold of M, for each $a \in \,]0,1]$ such that $T_p(f)$ is a-hyperbolic.*

Proof. Let $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a := W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p)$ and $\Omega \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a$ be as in Theorem 1.3. Since f restricts to a diffeomorphism of W^{s}_a, the image $f(\Omega)$ is relatively open in Ω. Hence, there exists an open p-neighbourhood $Q \subseteq M$ such that $\Omega \cap Q \subseteq f(\Omega)$. By "(b)⇒(a)" in Proposition 10.2, we may assume that $f(Q) \subseteq Q$, after replacing Q with a smaller neighbourhood of p is necessary. We claim that

$$W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap Q = \Omega \cap Q\,. \tag{48}$$

If this is true, then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap Q$ is a submanifold of M, and hence also

$$f^{-n}(W^{\mathrm{s}}_a) \cap f^{-n}(Q) = W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap f^{-n}(Q)$$

is a submanifold of M (as $f^{-n}\colon M \to M$ is a diffeomorphism). Since $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} f^{-n}(Q)$ is an open subset of M which contains W^{s}_a (exploiting that $f^n(x) \in Q$ for large n, for each $x \in W^{\mathrm{s}}_a$), we deduce that W^{s}_a is a submanifold of M (and the submanifold structure coincides with the immersed submanifold structure constructed earlier).

To prove (48), suppose that $x \in W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap Q$ but $x \notin \Omega \cap Q$ (and hence $x \notin \Omega$). Since $f(Q) \subseteq Q$, we then have

$$f^n(x) \in Q \quad \text{for all } \; n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

By definition of Ω, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $f^n(x) \in \Omega$. We choose n minimal and note that $n \geq 1$ as $x \notin \Omega$ by hypothesis. Then $f^n(x) \in \Omega \cap Q \subseteq f(\Omega)$ and hence $f^{n-1}(x) = f^{-1}(f^n(x)) \in f^{-1}(f(\Omega)) = \Omega$, contradicting the minimality of n. Hence x cannot exist and thus $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap Q \subseteq \Omega \cap Q$. The converse inclusion, $\Omega \cap Q \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a \cap Q$, being trivial, (48) is proved. □

12 Further conclusions in the finite-dimensional case

We collect further results which are easily available in the finite-dimensional case (and required in [20]). In particular, we study the dependence of a-stable manifolds on the parameter a.

Proposition 12.1 *Let M be an analytic manifold modelled on a finite-dimensional vector space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$. Let $p \in M$ be a fixed point of an analytic diffeomorphism $f\colon M \to M$. Abbreviate $\alpha := T_p(f)$ and define $R(\alpha)$ as in* 9.1*. Then the following holds:*

(a) *If $R(\alpha) \subseteq \,]0,1]$, then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p)$ is a submanifold of M, for each $a \in \,]0,1] \setminus R(\alpha)$.*

(b) *If $0 < a < b \leq 1$ and $[a,b] \cap R(\alpha) = \emptyset$, then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p) = W^{\mathrm{s}}_b(f,p)$.*

(c) *If $a \in \,]0,1]$ and $]0,a] \cap R(\alpha) = \emptyset$, then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(f,p) = \{p\}$.*

Proof. (a) follows from Proposition 11.1 (using Corollary 9.7 and (46)).

(b) Let E and κ be as in 3.2 (with $M_0 := M$), $\|.\|$ be a norm on E adapted to $\alpha := T_p(f)$, and $R(\alpha)$ as well as the subspaces $E_\rho \subseteq E$ for $\rho > 0$ be as in 9.1. By hypothesis on a and b, we have

$$X := \bigoplus_{\rho<a} E_\rho = \bigoplus_{\rho<b} E_\rho \quad \text{and} \quad Y := \bigoplus_{\rho>a} E_\rho = \bigoplus_{\rho>b} E_\rho\,.$$

Hence $E_{a,\mathrm{s}} = E_{b,\mathrm{s}} = X$ and $E_{a,\mathrm{u}} = E_{b,\mathrm{u}} = Y$, by (47). Now let Ω_a and Ω_b be an Ω as in Theorem 1.3, applied with a and b, respectively. By Theorem 6.2 (f) and the proof of Theorem 1.3, we may assume that $\Omega_a = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_a)$ and $\Omega_b = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_b)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_a &= \{z \in B_r^E(0)\colon (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0)\ g^n(z) \text{ is defined and } \|g^n(z)\| \leq a^n r\} \text{ and} \\ \Gamma_b &= \{z \in B_t^E(0)\colon (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0)\ g^n(z) \text{ is defined and } \|g^n(z)\| \leq b^n t\} \end{aligned} \qquad (49)$$

for certain $r, t > 0$ and g is as in (3.2). Moreover, by Theorem 6.2 (e), we may assume that $r = t$, after replacing each by $\min\{r, t\}$. Then $\Gamma_a \subseteq \Gamma_b$ by (49), and hence $\Gamma_a = \Gamma_b$ (since both sets are graphs of functions on the same domain, by Theorem 6.2). Thus $\Omega_a = \Omega_b$, entailing that $W_a^{\mathrm{s}}(f,p) = W_b^{\mathrm{s}}(f,p)$ as a set and also as an immersed submanifold of M (cf. proof of Theorem 1.3).

(c) By (47), we have $E_{a,\mathrm{s}} = \bigoplus_{\rho<a} E_\rho = \{0\}$, whence $\Omega = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma) = \{p\}$ in Theorem 1.3 and its proof. Thus $W_a^{\mathrm{s}}(f,p) = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} f^{-n}(\Omega) = \{p\}$. $\square$

13 Specific results concerning automorphisms of Lie groups

Throughout this section, G is an analytic Lie group modelled on an ultrametric Banach space over a complete ultrametric field $(\mathbb{K}, |.|)$, and $\alpha\colon G \to G$ an analytic automorphism. Then the neutral element $1 \in G$ is a fixed point of α, and hence our general theory applies. We now compile some additional conclusions which are specific to automorphisms. Like results of the previous sections, these are needed for the farther-reaching Lie-theoretic applications described in the introduction.

We begin with a corollary to Proposition 10.5. An automorphism $\alpha\colon G \to G$ is called *contractive* if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha^n(x) = 1$ for each $x \in G$.

Corollary 13.1 *If G is finite-dimensional and $\alpha\colon G\to G$ a contractive automorphism, then every eigenvalue λ of $L(\alpha)\otimes_{\mathbb{K}}\mathrm{id}_{\overline{\mathbb{K}}}$ in an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{K}}$ has absolute value $|\lambda|<1$.*

Proof. G is complete by [17, Proposition 2.1 (a)], and metrizable. Since every identity neighbourhood P in G contains an open subgroup U of G (see, e.g., [17, Proposition 2.1 (a)]), Lemma 1 (a) in [35] provides an α-invariant open subgroup $Q:=U_{(0)}\subseteq U\subseteq P$ of G. Hence 1 is a uniformly contractive fixed point of α, and thus "(a)⇒(c)" in Proposition 10.5 applies. $\square$

Proposition 13.2 *If $a\in\,]0,1]$ and $L(\alpha)$ is a-hyperbolic, the following holds:*

(a) *The a-stable manifold $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha,1)$ is an immersed Lie subgroup of G.*

(b) *If, moreover, $L(G)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $L(\alpha)$ and $L(G)_{1,\mathrm{u}}=\{0\}$, then $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha,1)$ is a Lie subgroup of G.*

Proof. (a) The proof of [20, Proposition 4.6] applies without changes.[11]

(b) is a special case of Proposition 11.1. $\square$

If G is finite-dimensional, then the extra hypotheses in Proposition 13.2 (b) mean that $R(L(\alpha))\subseteq\,]0,1]$ (see Corollary 9.7 and (46)).

In the following situation, hyperbolicity is not needed to make W^{s} a manifold.

Proposition 13.3 *If $\alpha\colon G\to G$ is an automorphism and $L(G)$ admits a centre subspace with respect to $L(\alpha)\colon L(G)\to L(G)$, then the following holds:*

(a) *There exist a local stable manifold V_1 and a centre manifold V_0 around 1 with respect to α, and a local stable manifold V_{-1} around 1 with respect to α^{-1}, such that $V_1V_0V_{-1}$ is open in G and the product map*

$$\pi\colon V_1\times V_0\times V_{-1}\to V_1V_0V_{-1}\quad (x,y,z)\mapsto xyz \tag{50}$$

is an analytic diffeomorphism.

(b) *There is a unique immersed submanifold structure on $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha,1)$ such that conditions (a)–(c) of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied. This immersed submanifold structure makes $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha,1)$ an immersed Lie subgroup of G, and the final assertion of Theorem 1.3 holds. Moreover, $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha,1)=W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha,1)$ for some $a\in\,]0,1[$ such that $L(\alpha)$ is a-hyperbolic.*

---

[11] In ◊, read "$\leq a^n$" as "$< a^n r$."

Proof. (a) Set $E := L(G)$ and let $E = E_1 \oplus E_0 \oplus E_{-1}$ be the decomposition into a stable subspace E_1, centre subspace E_0 and unstable subspace E_{-1} with respect to $L(\alpha)$, and $\|.\|$ be an ultrametric norm as in Definition 1.5. There is $a \in \,]0,1[$ such that $\|L(\alpha)|_{E_1}\| < a$ and $\frac{1}{\|L(\alpha)^{-1}|_{E_{-1}}\|} > \frac{1}{a}$. Then $L(\alpha)$ is a-hyperbolic with a-stable subspace E_1 and a-unstable subspace $E_0 \oplus E_{-1}$ (and the norm $\|.\|$ as before). Also $L(\alpha)^{-1}$ is a-hyperbolic, with a-stable subspace E_{-1} and a-unstable subspace $E_0 \oplus E_1$ (and the norm $\|.\|$ as before). We let V_1 be a local a-stable manifold around 1 with respect to α and V_{-1} be a local a-stable manifold around 1 with respect to α^{-1} (see Theorem 6.8 (a)); by Theorem 6.8 (c), we may assume that $V_1 \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$. Also, we let V_0 be a centre manifold around p with respect to α (see Theorem 1.10 (a)). Then $T_1(V_1) = E_1$, $T_1(V_0) = E_0$ and $T_1(V_{-1}) = E_{-1}$, whence

$$L(G) \;=\; T_1(V_1) \oplus T_1(V_0) \oplus T_1(V_{-1})\,.$$

Thus, after shrinking V_1, V_0 and V_{-1} (which is possible by Theorem 6.8 (c) and 1.10 (c)), we may assume that $P := V_1 V_0 V_{-1}$ is open in G and the product map (50) is an analytic diffeomorphism (by the Inverse Function Theorem).

(b) Shrinking V_1, V_0 and V_{-1} further is necessary, we may assume that there are $r > 0$ and charts $\kappa_j \colon V_j \to B^{E_j}_r(0)$ with $\kappa_j(1) = 0$ and $d\kappa_j = \mathrm{id}$ for $j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. There is $s \in \,]0, r]$ such that $\alpha(\kappa_j^{-1}(B^{E_j}_s(0))) \subseteq V_j$ for all $j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Let $g_j := \kappa_j \circ \alpha \circ \kappa_j^{-1}|_{B^{E_j}_s(0)}$. Shrinking s, we achieve that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_0(x)\| \;&=\; \|x\| && \text{for each } x \in B^{E_0}_s(0), && (51)\\
\|g_1(x)\| \;&<\; a\|x\| && \text{for each } x \in B^{E_1}_s(0), \text{ and} && (52)\\
\|g_{-1}(x)\| \;&>\; a^{-1}\|x\| && \text{for each } x \in B^{E_{-1}}_s(0) && (53)
\end{aligned}$$

(using (3) and parts (b) and (d) of Remark 2.5). Then

$$\kappa := (\kappa_1 \times \kappa_0 \times \kappa_{-1}) \circ \pi^{-1} \colon P \to B^E_r(0)$$

is a chart of G around 1. We set $g := g_1 \times g_0 \times g_{-1} \colon B^E_s(0) \to B^E_r(0)$ (where $B^E_s(0) = B^{E_1}_s(0) \times B^{E_0}_s(0) \times B^{E_{-1}}_s(0)$). Abbreviate $Q := \kappa^{-1}(B^E_s(0))$. Then

$$f|_Q = \kappa^{-1} \circ g \circ \kappa|_Q\,. \tag{54}$$

If $z \in W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$, there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\alpha^n(z) \in Q$ for all $n \geq n_0$, and

$$\|\kappa(\alpha^n(z))\| \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{55}$$

After replacing z with $f^{n_0}(z)$, we may assume that $n_0 = 0$. Now $x = (x_1, x_0, x_{-1}) := \kappa(z)$ is an element of $B^E_s(0)$ such that $g^n(x) \in B^E_s(0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (cf. (54)). Also

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|g^n(x)\| = 0\,, \tag{56}$$

by (55). Since $\|g^n(x)\| = \max\{\|g_1(x_1)\|, \|g_0(x_0)\|, \|g_{-1}(x_{-1})\|\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, using (51) and (53) we obtain a contradiction to (56) unless $x_0 = 0$ and $x_{-1} = 0$. Thus $x = x_1 \in E_1$ and thus $z = \kappa_1^{-1}(x_1) \in V_1 \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$, entailing that $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1) \subseteq W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$. The converse inclusion being trivial, we deduce that $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1) = W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$. We give $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$ the manifold structure of $W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$. It then is tangent to $E_{a,\mathrm{s}} = E_1$ at 1. Hence $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$ satisfies conditions (a)–(c) of Theorem 1.3, and also the final assertion of the theorem. To obtain the uniqueness of the immersed submanifold structure subject to these conditions, note that for any such structure on W^{s}, each neighbourhood of p in W^{s} contains am open f-invariant p-neighbourhood (as this only requires (3) and Remark 2.5 (d)). Now one shows as in the proof of Theorem 6.8 (b) that the germ of the latter coincides with the germ we already have, and this entails as in the proof of the uniqueness part of Theorem 1.3 that the new manifold structure on W^{s} coincides with the one we already had (further explanations are omitted, because the assertion is not central). All other assertions follow from Proposition 13.2. □

Corollary 13.4 *If G is a finite-dimensional Lie group, then there is a unique immersed submanifold structure on $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$ such that conditions* (a)–(c) *of Theorem* 1.3 *are satisfied. This immersed submanifold structure makes $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1)$ an immersed Lie subgroup of G. Moreover, $W^{\mathrm{s}}(\alpha, 1) = W^{\mathrm{s}}_a(\alpha, 1)$ for each $a \in\,]0, 1[$ such that $[a, 1[\, \cap R(L(\alpha)) = \emptyset$ and $]1, \frac{1}{a}] \cap R(L(\alpha)) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. If we choose $\|.\|$ as a norm adapted to $L(\alpha)$ (as in Definition 9.3) in the proof of Proposition 13.3, then E_1, E_0 and E_{-1} are the direct sum of all $L(G)_\rho$ with $\rho \in R(L(\alpha))$, such that $\rho \in\,]0, 1[$ (resp., $\rho = 1$, resp., $\rho \in\,]1, \infty[$), by (46). If a is as described in the current corollary, then $\|L(\alpha)\| < a$ and $\|L(\alpha)^{-1}\| < a$ (as is clear from (b) and (c) in Definition 9.3). Therefore the proof of Proposition 13.3 applies with this choice of a. □

A Proof of Proposition 4.2

For all integers $k \geq 2$, we choose $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, E_1)$, $\beta_k \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, E_2)$ and $\gamma_k \in \mathcal{L}^k(E, E_3)$ such that $a_k = \alpha_k \circ \Delta_k^E$, $b_k = \beta_k \circ \Delta_k^E$, $c_k = \gamma_k \circ \Delta_k^E$ and $\|\alpha_k\|, \|\beta_k\|, \|\gamma_k\| < 1$.

If ϕ is an analytic function of the form described in (c), then (b) holds and

$$\sup\{\|(d_k, e_k)\| \, s^k \colon k \geq 2\} \; < \; s \tag{57}$$

for each $s \in \,]0, r]$, entailing that $\phi(B_s^{E_2}(0)) \subseteq B_s^{E_1 \times E_3}(0)$. Now $f(\Gamma_s) = \Gamma_s$ for all $s \in \,]0, r]$ if we can prove that $f(\Gamma_r) \subseteq \Gamma_r$, exploiting that

$$B_s^{E_2}(0) \to E_2, \quad y \mapsto f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) = By + \widetilde{f}_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))$$

is an isometry with image $B_s^{E_2}(0)$ (by Remark 2.6). In particular,

$$\|f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))\| = \|y\| < s \tag{58}$$

for all $s \in \,]0, r]$ and $y \in B_s^{E_2}(0)$. Applying (57) with $s = r$, we see that $f(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))$ is defined for all $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$ and given globally by its Taylor series around 0 (by Lemma 2.3). Now let $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$. In view of (58) (applied with $s = r$), we have $f(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) \in \Gamma_r$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} &f(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) \\ &\quad = \; \big(\phi_1(f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))),\; f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)),\; \phi_3(f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)))\big), \end{aligned}$$

which holds if and only if

$$f_1(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) \;=\; \phi_1(f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))) \quad \text{and} \tag{59}$$

$$f_3(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y)) \;=\; \phi_3(f_2(\phi_1(y), y, \phi_3(y))). \tag{60}$$

We mention that the right hand sides of (59) and (60) are given on all of $B_r^{E_2}(0)$ by their Taylor series around 0, since the homogeneous polynomial ζ_j of degree j of the Taylor series of $f_2 \circ (\phi_1, \mathrm{id}, \phi_3)$ around 0 vanishes if $j = 0$ and has norm $\|\zeta_j\| \leq 1$ if $j \geq 1$ (as will be verified in (71) and (73)), whence $\|\zeta_j\| r^j \leq r$ and so Lemma 2.3 applies. Therefore the validity of (59) and (60) for all $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$ is equivalent to their validity on $B_t^{E_2}(0)$ for some $t \in \,]0, r]$ (as in (a)), and is also equivalent to two identities for formal series, namely

$$\begin{aligned} &A(d_2(y) + d_3(y) + \cdots) \\ &\quad + \, a_2(d_2(y) + \cdots, y, e_2(y) + \cdots) \; + \; a_3(d_2(y) + \cdots, y, e_2(y) + \cdots) + \cdots \\ &\quad = d_2\big(By + b_2(d_2(y) + \cdots, y, e_2(y) + \cdots) + b_3(\cdots) + \cdots\big) \\ &\quad + \, d_3\big(By + b_2(d_2(y) + \cdots, y, e_2(y) + \cdots) + b_3(\cdots) + \cdots\big) \; + \; \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&C(e_2(y)+e_3(y)+\cdots)\\ &\qquad + c_2(d_2(y)+\cdots,y,e_2(y)+\cdots)\ +\ c_3(d_2(y)+\cdots,y,e_2(y)+\cdots)+\cdots\\ &\ = e_2\big(By+b_2(d_2(y)+\cdots,y,e_2(y)+\cdots)+b_3(\cdots)+\cdots\big)\\ &\ + e_3\big(By+b_2(d_2(y)+\cdots,y,e_2(y)+\cdots)+b_3(\cdots)+\cdots\big)\ +\ \cdots\,. \qquad (62)\end{aligned}$$

Equality of the second order terms on both sides of (61) means that

$$Ad_2(y)+a_2(0,y,0)=d_2(By)\,, \tag{63}$$

which can be rewritten as $(B^*-A_*)(d_2)=a_2(0,\bullet,0)$ with $A_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(E_2,A)$ and $B^*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(B,E_1)$. Since $B^*-A_*=B^*(\mathrm{id}-(B^{-1})^*A_*)$ with $\|(B^{-1})^*A_*\| \leq \|B^{-1}\|^2\|A\|<1$, we see that

$$d_2=(B^*-A_*)^{-1}a_2(0,\bullet,0)=(\mathrm{id}-(B^{-1})^*A_*)^{-1}(B^{-1})^*a_2(0,\bullet,0) \tag{64}$$

is the unique solution to (63), and $\|d_2\|\leq\|B^{-1}\|^2\|a_2(0,\bullet,0)\|<1$.

Equality of the second order terms in (62) means that

$$Ce_2(y)+c_2(0,y,0)=e_2(By)\,, \tag{65}$$

which can be rewritten as $(C_*-B^*)(e_2)=-c_2(0,\bullet,0)$ with $C_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(E_2,C)$ and $B^*:=\mathrm{Pol}^2(B,E_3)$. Since $C_*-B^*=C_*(\mathrm{id}-(C^{-1})_*B^*)$ with $\|(C^{-1})_*B^*\| \leq \|C^{-1}\|\cdot\|B\|^2<1$, we see that

$$e_2=-(C_*-B^*)^{-1}c_2(0,\bullet,0)=(\mathrm{id}-(C^{-1})_*B^*)^{-1}(C^{-1})_*\,c_2(0,\bullet,0) \tag{66}$$

is the unique solution to (65), and $\|e_2\|\leq\|C^{-1}\|\cdot\|c_2(0,\bullet,0)\|<1$.

Let $n\geq 3$ now and, by induction, suppose we have found $d_k\in\mathrm{Pol}^k(E_2,E_1)$ and $e_k\in\mathrm{Pol}^k(E_2,E_3)$ with $\|d_k\|,\|e_k\|<1$ for $k=2,\ldots,n-1$, such that (61) and (62) hold up to order $n-1$ if these $d_2,\ldots,d_{n-1}$ and $e_2,\ldots,e_{n-1}$ are used. For $k=2,\ldots,n-1$, let $\delta_k\in\mathcal{L}^k(E_2,E_1)$ and $\eta_k\in\mathcal{L}^k(E_2,E_3)$ such that $d_k=\delta_k\circ\Delta_k^{E_2}$, $e_k=\eta_k\circ\Delta_k^{E_2}$, and $\|\delta_k\|,\|\eta_k\|<1$. Define $\xi_1(y):=(0,y,0)\in E$ for $y\in E_2$ and $\xi_k:=(\delta_k,0,\eta_k)\in\mathrm{Pol}^k(E_2,E)$ for $k\in\{2,\ldots,n-1\}$.

Let $B^*:=\mathrm{Pol}^n(B,E_1)$ and $A_*:=\mathrm{Pol}^n(E_2,A)$. Equality of the n-th order terms on both sides of (61) amounts to

$$A_*(d_n)+r_n=B^*(d_n)+s_n \tag{67}$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_n &= \sum_{k=2}^{n} \sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}} \alpha_k\circ(\xi_{j_1},\ldots,\xi_{j_k}) \quad\text{and} && (68)\\
s_n &= \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}} \delta_k\circ(\zeta_{j_1},\ldots,\zeta_{j_k}), \quad\text{where} && (69)\\
\zeta_j &= \sum_{\ell=2}^{j} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\ldots,i_\ell\in\mathbb{N}\\ i_1+\cdots+i_\ell=j}} \beta_\ell\circ(\xi_{i_1},\ldots,\xi_{i_\ell}) \quad\text{for } j=2,\ldots,n-1 && (70)
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\zeta_1 := B$, where

$$\|\zeta_1\| \;=\; \|B\| \;\leq\; 1\,. \tag{71}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we see that

$$\|r_n\| < 1\,. \tag{72}$$

Likewise, the norm of each summand in (70) is < 1, and thus

$$\|\zeta_j\| \;<\; 1\,. \tag{73}$$

As a consequence, the norm of each summand in (69) is $\leq \|\delta_k\|\cdot 1 < 1$. Therefore,

$$\|s_n\| < 1\,. \tag{74}$$

In view of Lemma 2.2, (4), (72) and (74),

$$d_n := (B^*-A_*)^{-1}(r_n-s_n) = (\mathrm{id}-(B^{-1})^*A_*)^{-1}(B^{-1})^*(r_n-s_n) \in \mathrm{Pol}^n(E_2,E_1)$$

is the unique solution to (67), of norm $\|d_n\| < 1$.

Define $B^* := \mathrm{Pol}^n(B,E_3)$ and $C_* := \mathrm{Pol}^n(E_2,C)$. Equality of the n-th order terms on both sides of (62) amounts to

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_*(e_n)+\rho_n &= B^*(e_n)+\sigma_n \quad\text{with} && (75)\\
\rho_n &= \sum_{k=2}^{n} \sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}} \gamma_k\circ(\xi_{j_1},\ldots,\xi_{j_k}) \quad\text{and}\\
\sigma_n &= \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\in\mathbb{N}\\ j_1+\cdots+j_k=n}} \eta_k\circ(\zeta_{j_1},\ldots,\zeta_{j_k})
\end{aligned}
$$

(with ζ_j from above). As before, we see that $\|\rho_n\|, \|\sigma_n\| < 1$ and that

$$e_n := (C_* - B^*)^{-1}(\sigma_n - \rho_n) = (\mathrm{id} - (C^{-1})_* B^*)^{-1}(C^{-1})_*(\sigma_n - \rho_n) \in \mathrm{Pol}^n(E_2, E_3)$$

is the unique solution to (75), of norm $\|e_n\| < 1$. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.2.

B Proof of Theorem 8.3

As usual, we first discuss the situation in a local chart.

B.1 We retain the setting (and notation) from 6.1, except that we now assume that $a \in [1, \infty[$ (instead of $a \in \,]0, 1]$).

Theorem B.2 *In the situation of* B.1*, consider the set* Γ *of all* $z_0 \in B_r^E(0)$ *for which there exists a sequence* $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *in* E *such that*

$$a^n \|z_n\| < r \quad \text{and} \quad f(z_{n+1}) = z_n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} a^n \|z_n\| = 0. \tag{76}$$

Then Γ *has properties* (a) *and* (b):

(a) Γ *is locally* f*-invariant, more precisely* $f\big(\Gamma \cap B_{r/c}^E(0)\big) \subseteq \Gamma$ *with* $c := \max\{1, \mathrm{Lip}(f)\}$.

(b) $\Gamma = \{(\phi(y), y) \colon y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)\}$ *for an analytic map* $\phi \colon B_r^{E_2}(0) \to B_r^{E_1}(0)$ *with* $\phi(0) = 0$ *and* $\phi'(0) = 0$ *(whence* $T_0\Gamma = E_2$*).*

Moreover, the following holds:

(c) ϕ *is Lipschitz, with* $\mathrm{Lip}(\phi) \le 1$.

(d) *For each* $s \in \,]0, r]$*, the set* $\Gamma \cap B_s^E(0)$ *has properties analogous to those of* Γ *described in* (76) *and* (b) *if we replace* r *with* s *there.*

Proof. (b) Let $b := \frac{1}{a}$. We abbreviate $\mathcal{U} := B_r^{\mathcal{S}_b(E)}(0)$ and consider the map $g \colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{S}_b(E)$ taking $z = (z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{U}$ with $z_n = (x_n, y_n)$ to the sequence $g(z)$ with n-th entry

$$g(z)_n := \begin{cases} \big(f_1(z_1),\, 0\big) & \text{if } n = 0; \\ \big(f_1(z_{n+1}),\, B^{-1}(y_{n-1} - \widetilde{f}_2(z_n))\big) & \text{if } n \ge 1 \end{cases} \tag{77}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $g(0) = 0$. Using the left shift λ on $\mathcal{S}_b(E_1)$, the left shift Λ on $\mathcal{S}_b(E_2)$, the right shift ρ on $\mathcal{S}_b(E_2)$ and the projection $\mathrm{pr}_2\colon E = E_1 \oplus E_2 \to E_2$, we can write g in the form

$$g \;=\; \bigl(\lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_b(f_1),\; \rho \circ \mathcal{S}_b(B^{-1}) \circ (\mathcal{S}_b(\mathrm{pr}_2) - \Lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_b(\widetilde{f_2}))\bigr)\,.$$

In view of Lemma 5.3 (a) and (e), Lemma 5.4 (a) and Proposition 5.5, this formula shows that g is analytic and Lipschitz with $\mathrm{Lip}(g) < 1$. Now

$$G \;:=\; \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{U}} - g\colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$$

is an analytic diffeomorphism and an isometry, by the Ultrametric Inverse Function Theorem (Theorem 2.4) and the domination principle (3). The map

$$w\colon B_r^{E_2}(0) \to \mathcal{U}\,, \quad w(y) := G^{-1}\bigl((0,y),(0,0),\ldots\bigr)$$

is analytic and $(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{U}} - g)(w(y)) = G(w(y)) = ((0,y),(0,0),\ldots)$, i.e.,

$$w(y) = \bigl((0,y),(0,0),\ldots\bigr) + g(w(y)) \tag{78}$$

for all $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$. Comparing the 0-th component on both sides of (78), we see that $w(y)_0 = (0,y) + \bigl(f_1(w(y)_1),\, 0\bigr)$ and thus

$$w(y)_0 = (\phi(y), y)\,,$$

where $\phi\colon B_r^{E_2}(0) \to B_r^{E_1}(0)$ is the analytic function given by

$$\phi(y) := f_1(w(y)_1)\,. \tag{79}$$

Then $\phi(0) = 0$, and since $g'(0) = \bigl(\lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_b(A \circ \mathrm{pr}_1),\, \rho \circ \mathcal{S}_b(B^{-1}) \circ \mathcal{S}_b(\mathrm{pr}_2)\bigr) = D_1 \oplus D_2$ with $D_1 := \lambda \circ \mathcal{S}_b(A)$ and $D_2 := \rho \circ \mathcal{S}_b(B^{-1})$ of operator norm < 1 (cf. proof of Proposition 5.5), we have

$$(G^{-1})'(0) = (G'(0))^{-1} = (\mathrm{id} - (D_1 \oplus D_2))^{-1} = \mathrm{id} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_1^k \oplus D_2^k\,.$$

Thus $w'(0).v = (G^{-1})'(0).((0,v),(0,0),\ldots) = ((0,v),(0,B^{-1}v),(0,B^{-2}v),\ldots)$ for all $v \in E_2$, and hence $\phi'(0) = 0$.

We claim that $w(y)_n = f(w(y)_{n+1})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and each $y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$. If this is true, then $w(y) \in \mathcal{U}$ implies that $a^n \|w(y)_n\|$ is $< r$ and tends to 0 as

$n \to \infty$. Hence $(\phi(y), y) \in \Gamma$ and thus $(\phi(y), y)\colon y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)\} \subseteq \Gamma$.

To prove the claim, let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Looking at the second component of the entry in (78) indexed by $n+1$ and the first component of the entry indexed by n, we see that

$$\mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_{n+1}) = B^{-1}(\mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_n) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(y)_{n+1})) \tag{80}$$

and $\mathrm{pr}_1(w(y)_n) = f_1(w(y)_{n+1})$. Multiplying (80) with B, we obtain

$$B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_{n+1}) = \mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_n) - \widetilde{f}_2(w(y)_{n+1})\,,$$

whence $\mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_n) = B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(w(y)_{n+1}) + \widetilde{f}_2(w(y)_{n+1}) = f_2(w(y)_{n+1})$ and hence indeed $w(y)_n = f(w(y)_{n+1})$. The claim is established.

To get (b), it only remains to show that $\Gamma \subseteq \{(\phi(y), y)\colon y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)\}$. To prove this inclusion, let $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \Gamma$; pick $z := (z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ as in the definition of Γ. Then $z \in \mathcal{U}$ (since $a^n\|z_n\| < r$ and $a^n\|z_n\| \to 0$ by definition of Γ). We claim that

$$z = ((0, y_0), (0, 0), \ldots) + g(z)\,. \tag{81}$$

If this is true, then $G(z) = z - g(z) = ((0, y_0), (0, 0), \ldots)$ and hence $z = G^{-1}((0, y_0), (0, 0), \ldots) = w(y_0)$. As a consequence, $z_0 = w(y_0)_0 = (\phi(y_0), y_0)$ and thus $z_0 \in \{(\phi(y), y)\colon y \in B_r^{E_2}(0)\}$. To prove the claim, note first that $\mathrm{pr}_2(z_0) = y_0$, which is also the second component of the 0-th entry of the right hand side of (81). Given $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, equality of the first component of the index n entry of the sequences on the left and right of (81) means that

$$\mathrm{pr}_1(z_n) = f_1(z_{n+1})\,,$$

which holds by choice of z. Next, if $n \geq 1$ we use that $\mathrm{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) = \mathrm{pr}_2(f(z_n)) = B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(z_n) + \widetilde{f}_2(z_n)$, whence $B\,\mathrm{pr}_2(z_n) = \mathrm{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) - \widetilde{f}_2(z_n)$ and hence

$$\mathrm{pr}_2(z_n) = B^{-1}(\mathrm{pr}_2(z_{n-1}) - \widetilde{f}_2(z_n))\,.$$

Therefore the second components of the n-th entries of the sequences on the left and right of (81) coincide. As n was arbitrary, (81) holds.

(c) Let $y, z \in B_r^{E_2}(0)$. Using that G is an isometry, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| &\leq \|(\phi(y), y) - (\phi(z), z)\| = \|w(y)_0 - w(z)_0\| \leq \|w(y) - w(z)\|_b \\
&= \|G^{-1}((0, y), (0, 0), \ldots) - G^{-1}((0, z), (0, 0), \ldots)\|_b \\
&= \|((0, y - z), (0, 0), \ldots)\|_b = \|y - z\|.
\end{aligned}$$

(d) If $s \in]0,r]$, let Γ_s be the set of all $z_0 \in B^E_s(0)$ for which there exists a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $a^n\|z_n\| < s$, $f(z_{n+1}) = z_n$ and $a^n\|z_n\| \to 0$. Applying (b) to $f|_{B^E_s(0)}$ instead of f, we find that $\Gamma_s = \{(\psi(y), y) \colon y \in B^{E_2}_s(0)\}$ corresponds to the graph of an analytic function $\psi\colon B^{E_2}_s(0) \to B^{E_1}_s(0)$. Since $\Gamma_s \subseteq \Gamma$, it follows that ψ is the restriction of ϕ to $B^{E_2}_s(0)$ and $\Gamma \cap B^E_s(0) = \Gamma_s$. Since Γ_s has been obtained in the same way as Γ, it has analogous properties.

(a) Let $s := \frac{r}{c} \leq r$. Then $\Gamma \cap B^E_s(0) = \Gamma_s$ (by (d)). Given $z_0 \in \Gamma_s$, pick $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ as in the proof of (d). To see that $f(z_0) \in \Gamma$ (as required), define $\zeta_n := f(z_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $a^n\|\zeta_n\| = a^n\|f(z_n)\| \leq \mathrm{Lip}(f)a^n\|z_n\| < cs = r$ and $a^n\|\zeta_n\| \leq \mathrm{Lip}(f)a^n\|z_n\| \to 0$, showing that $f(z_0) = \zeta_0$ is in Γ. □

Proof of Theorem 8.3. (a) Let E_1 be the a-stable subspace and E_2 be the a-unstable subspace of $E := T_p(M)$ with respect to $T_p(f)$, and $\|.\|$ be a norm on $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ as in Definition 1.1. Let $\kappa\colon P \to U$, Q, $r > 0$ and $g\colon B^E_r(0) \to E$ be as in 3.2; thus $g'(0) = T_p(f)$. For $s \in]0,r]$, let Γ_s be the set of all $z_0 \in B^E_s(0)$ for which there exists a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in E such that $a^n\|z_n\| < s$ and $g(z_{n+1}) = z_n$ for each n, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} a^n\|z_n\| = 0$. After shrinking r if necessary, Theorem B.2 can be applied with g in place of f (cf. Remark 2.5 (d)). Hence, there exists an analytic map

$$\phi\colon B^{E_2}_r(0) \to B^{E_1}_r(0)$$

with $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi'(0) = 0$, such that $\Gamma_s = \{(\phi(y), y)\colon y \in B^{E_2}_s(0)\}$ and $g(\Gamma_{s/c}) \subseteq \Gamma_s$ for each $s \in]0,r]$, with $c := \max\{1, \mathrm{Lip}(f)\}$. Then Γ_s is a submanifold of $B^E_s(0)$ and g restricts to an analytic map $\Gamma_{s/c} \to \Gamma_s$ for each $s \in]0,r]$. Now $\Omega_s := \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_s)$ is a submanifold of $\kappa^{-1}(B^E_s(0))$ (and hence of M), such that $\Omega_{s/c} \subseteq \Omega_s$ is an open p-neighbourhood, $f(\Omega_{s/c}) \subseteq \Omega_s$, and $f|_{\Omega_{s/c}}\colon \Omega_{s/c} \to \Omega_s$ is analytic. Also, $T_p(\Omega_s) = E_2$ because $T_0(\Gamma_s) = E_2$, and hence each Ω_s is a local a-unstable manifold around p with respect to f.

(b) We retain the notation from the proof of (a), set $B := (T_p(f))|_{E_2}$ and pick $b \in]a, \frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|}[$. We let N be any local a-unstable manifold around p with respect to f, and $S \subseteq N$ be an open p-neighbourhood such that $f(S) \subseteq N$ and $f|_S\colon S \to N$ is analytic. Consider a chart $\mu\colon V \to B^{E_2}_\tau(0)$ of N around p such that $V \subseteq S$, $\mu(p) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_2}$. There exists $\sigma \in]0,\tau]$ such that $h := \mu \circ f \circ \mu^{-1}$ is defined on all of $B^{E_2}_\sigma(0)$. Since $h'(0) = T_p(f|_N) = B$ with $\frac{1}{\|B^{-1}\|} > b$, Theorem 2.4 (b) shows that, after possibly shrinking σ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(B^{E_2}_s(0)) &= B.B^{E_2}_s(0) \supseteq B^{E_2}_{bs}(0) \text{ for all } s \in]0,\sigma], \text{ and hence} \\ h(B^{E_2}_{b^{-1}s}(0)) &\supseteq B^{E_2}_s(0) \quad \text{for all } s \in]0, b\sigma]. \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Now write $g = (g_1, g_2) = g'(0) + \widetilde{g}\colon B^E_r(0) \to E_1 \oplus E_2$, where $\mathrm{Lip}(\widetilde{g}) < a$ and $g'(0) = A \oplus B$ with B as before and $A := T_p(f)|_{E_1}$. Then $Q \cap N$ is an immersed submanifold of Q tangent to E_2 and, after replacing N by an open p-neighbourhood therein, we may assume that N is a submanifold of Q. Since $\kappa(N)$ is tangent to E_2 at $0 \in E$, the inverse function theorem implies that $\kappa(N) = \{(\psi(y), y)\colon y \in W\}$ for some open 0-neighbourhood $W \subseteq B^{E_2}_r(0)$ and analytic map $\psi\colon W \to E_1$ with $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\psi) \leq 1$ (after shrinking N if necessary). Then $\mu := \mathrm{pr}_2 \circ \kappa|_N$ is a chart for N with $\mu(p) = 0$ and $d\mu(p) = \mathrm{id}_{E_2}$ (where $\mathrm{pr}_2\colon E_1 \oplus E_2 \to E_2$). Hence, by the discussion leading to (82), there is $\sigma \in \,]0, r]$ with $B^{E_2}_\sigma(0) \subseteq W$ and

$$g(\Theta_{b^{-1}s}) \;\supseteq\; \Theta_s \quad \text{for all } s \in \,]0, \sigma], \tag{83}$$

where $\Theta_s := \{(\psi(y), y)\colon y \in B^{E_2}_s(0)\}$ for $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$. Note that $\|z\| = \|y\| < s$ for all $s \in \,]0, \sigma]$ and $z = (\psi(y), y) \in \Theta_s$, since $\mathrm{Lip}(\psi) \leq 1$. Let $z_0 \in \Theta_s$. Recursively, using (83), we find a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $z_n \in \Theta_{b^{-n}s}$ and $g(z_n) = z_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\|z_n\| < b^{-n}s < a^{-n}s$ and $a^n\|z_n\| < (\frac{a}{b})^n s \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, whence $z_0 \in \Gamma_s$. Hence $\Theta_s \subseteq \Gamma_s$ and thus $\Theta_s = \Gamma_s$ (as both sets are graphs of functions on the same domain). Hence Θ_σ is an open submanifold of Γ_r. As a consequence, Ω_σ is an open submanifold of Ω_r which contains p, and it is also an open submanifold of N as $\Omega_\sigma = \kappa^{-1}(\Gamma_\sigma) = \kappa^{-1}(\Theta_\sigma) = \mu^{-1}(B^{E_2}_\sigma(0))$. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Abbondandolo, A. and P. Majer, *On the global stable manifold*, Studia Math. **177** (2006), 113–131.

[2] Aguayo, J., M. Saavedra, M. Vallas, *Attracting and repelling points of analytic dynamical systems of several variables in a non-archimedean formulation*, Theoret. and Math. Phys. **140** (2004), 1175–1181.

[3] Aguayo, J., J. Gomeéz, M. Saavedra and M. Wallace, *Perturbation of a p-adic dynamical systems in two variables*, pp. 39–51 in: Contemp. Math. **384**, AMS, 2005.

[4] Albeverio, S., S. De Smedt, A. Yu. Khrennikov and B. Tirotstsi, *p-adic dynamical systems*, Theor. and Math. Phys. **114** (1998), 276–287.

[5] Baumgartner, U. and G. A. Willis, *Contraction groups and scales of automorphisms of totally disconnected, locally compact groups*, Israel J. Math. **142** (2004), 221–248.

[6] Benedetto, R. L., *Hyperbolic maps in p-adic dynamics*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), 1–11.

[7] Benedetto, R. L., *Wandering domains in non-Archimedean polynomial dynamics*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **38** (2006), 937–950.

[8] Bertram, W., H. Glöckner and K.-H. Neeb, *Differential calculus over general base fields and rings*, Expo. Math. **22** (2004), 213–282.

[9] Bézivin, J.-P., *Sur les ensembles de Julia et Fatou des fonctions entières ultramétriques*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **51** (2001), 1635–1661.

[10] Bourbaki, N., "Variétés différentielles et analytiques. Fascicule de résultats," Hermann, Paris, 1967.

[11] Bourbaki, N., "Lie Groups and Lie Algebras" (Chapters 1–3), Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1989.

[12] de la Llave, R. and C. E. Wayne, *On Irwin's proof of the pseudostable manifold theorem*, Math. Z. **219** (1995), 301–321.

[13] Escassut, A., "Ultrametric Banach Algebras," World Scientific, 2003.

[14] Favre, C. and J. Rivera-Letelier, *Théorème d'équidistribution de Brolin en dynamique p-adique*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **339** (2004), 271–276.

[15] Glöckner, H., *Scale functions on p-adic Lie groups*, Manuscr. Math. **97** (1998), 205–215.

[16] Glöckner, H., *Lie groups over local fields of positive characteristic need not be analytic*, J. Algebra **285** (2005), 356–371.

[17] Glöckner, H., *Every smooth p-adic Lie group admits a compatible analytic structure*, Forum Math. **18** (2006), 45–84.

[18] Glöckner, H., *Implicit functions from topological vector spaces to Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **155** (2006), 205–252.

[19] Glöckner, H., *Comparison of some notions of C^k-maps in multi-variable non-archimedean analysis*, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin **14** (2007), 877–904.

[20] Glöckner, H., *Contractible Lie groups over local fields*, Math. Z. (online first); cf. arXiv:0704.3737v1.

[21] Glöckner, H., *Lectures on Lie groups over local fields*, preprint, arXiv:0804.2234v3.

[22] Glöckner, H., *Scale functions on Lie groups over local fields of positive characteristic*, in preparation.

[23] Glöckner, H., *Finite order differentiability properties, fixed points and implicit functions over valued fields*, preprint, arXiv:math.FA/0511218.

[24] Hasselblatt, B. and A. Katok, "Handbook of Dynamical Systems," Volume 1 A, Elsevier, 2002.

[25] Herman, M. and J.-C. Yoccoz, *Generalizations of some theorems of small divisors to non-Archimedean fields*, pp. 408–447 in: J. Palis, Jr. (ed.), “Geometric Dynamics,” Lecture Notes in Math. **1007**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[26] Hirsch, M. W., C. C. Pugh and M. Shub, “Invariant Manifolds,” Springer, 1977.

[27] Irwin, M. C., *On the stable manifold theorem*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **2** (1970), 196–198.

[28] Irwin, M. C., *A new proof of the pseudostable manifold theorem*, J. London Math. Soc. **21** (1980), 557–566.

[29] Lindahl, K.-O., ”On the linearization of non-Archimedean holomorphic functions near an indifferent fixed point, Ph.D.-thesis, Växjö, 2007; available in electronic form at http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:vxu:diva-1713

[30] Lubin, J., *Non-Archimedean dynamical systems*, Compositio Math. **94** (1994), 321–346.

[31] Margulis, G. A., “Discrete Subgroups of Semisimple Lie Groups,” Springer, 1991.

[32] Nilsson, M., *Fuzzy cycles of p-adic monomial dynamical systems*, Far East J. Dyn. Syst. **5** (2003), 149–173.

[33] Raja, C. R. E., *On classes of p-adic Lie groups*, New York J. Math. **5** (1999), 101–105.

[34] Schikhof, W. H., “Ultrametric Calculus,” Cambridge University Press, 1984.

[35] Siebert, E., *Semisimple convolution semigroups and the topology of contraction groups*, pp. 325–343 in: H. Heyer (ed.), “Probability Measures on Groups IX” (Oberwolfach 1988), Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[36] van Rooij, A. C. M., ‘Non-Archimedean Functional Analysis,” Marcel Dekker, 1978.

[37] Vieugue, D., “Problèmes de linéarisation dans des familles de germes analytiques,” Ph.D.-thesis, Université d’Orleans, 2005; available in electronic form at http://www.univ-orleans.fr/mapmo/publications/vieugue/these.php

[38] Wang, J. S. P., *The Mautner phenomenon for p-adic Lie groups*, Math. Z. **185** (1984), 403–412.

[39] Weil, A., “Basic Number Theory,” Springer-Verlag, 1967.

[40] Wells, J. C., *Invariant manifolds of non-linear operators*, Pacific J. Math. **62** (1976), 285–293.

[41] Willis, G. A., *The structure of totally disconnected, locally compact groups*, Math. Ann. **300** (1994), 341–363.

[42] Willis, G. A, *Further properties of the scale function on a totally disconnected group*, J. Algebra **237** (2001), 142–164.

Helge Glöckner, Universität Paderborn, Institut für Mathematik, Warburger Str. 100,
33098 Paderborn, Germany. E-Mail: glockner@math.upb.de